DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 211 429 SO 013 811

AUTHOR Hertzberg, Hazel Whitman
TITLE Social Studies Reform 1880-1980.
INSTITUTION Social Science Education Consortium, Inc., Boulder, Colo.
SPONS AGENCY National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C. Directorate for Science and Engineering Education.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-89994-270-9
PUB DATE 81
GRANT SED-7718598
NOTE 201p.
AVAILABLE FROM SSEC Publications, 855 Broadway, Boulder, CO 80302 ($12.95).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Citizenship Education; *Curriculum Development; Definitions; *Educational Change; *Educational History; Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; Professional Associations; Relevance (Education); Social Sciences; *Social Studies; State of the Art Reviews
IDENTIFIERS New Social Studies; World War II

ABSTRACT

The purposes, methodologies, and curricula of the social studies over the past 100 years are examined in this paper. This history was written to provide a useful background for current efforts to reform the social studies. The paper, which consists of nine chapters, begins with a discussion of the meanings, definitions, and beginnings of social studies. The three factors that set the stage for the development of the social studies are examined: the rise of the public high school, the growth of the universities, and the emergence of professional societies. Chapter two examines the 1916 report and the 1920s. The American Historical Association (AHA) Commission on the social studies and the 1930s are treated in chapter three. Chapter four examines the effect that World War II had on the social studies. The "New Social Studies" movement is the topic of chapters five, six, and seven. What happened in the 1970s is discussed in chapter eight. Following the summary and comments of chapter nine, there are name and subject indexes. (Author/RM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED211429

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

SSEC

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SOCIAL STUDIES REFORM
1880-1980

By Hazel Whitman Hertzberg

SO 013 811

A Project SPAN Report

Social Science Education Consortium, Inc.

Boulder, Colorado

1981

ORDERING INFORMATION

This book is available from:

SSEC Publications
855 Broadway
Boulder, Colorado 80302

ISBN 0-89994-270-9

Price: $12.95

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CATALOGING IN PUBLICATION DATA

Hertzberg, Hazel W.
Social studies reform, 1880-1980.

(The Project SPAN reports)
includes bibliographical references and index.
1. Social sciences--Study and teaching (Secondary)--United States--History. I. Title. II. Series.
H62.5.U5H47 300'.7'1273 81-18491
ISBN 0-89994-270-9 AACR2

This work was supported by the Research in Science Education (RISE) Program of the National Science Foundation, Grant no. SED-7718598. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed herein are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

Copyright 1981 by Hazel W. Hertzberg

FOREWORD

A common criticism made of educational reform efforts, not least of the mighty and varied efforts known as the "new social studies," is the lament that reformers often proceed without knowledge of past efforts. Wheels are reinvented and resources are wasted.

The critics have a telling point, but how do reformers gain that essential knowledge of the past? Must every educational change effort begin with a lengthy detour through the archives? While many excellent historical materials about social studies reforms and reformers exist, there has been no convenient single source that would enlighten those who are willing to learn from the past but unable to make a career of it. Hazel W. Hertzberg provides here such a source, which we are pleased to present as an essential part of Project SPAN's effort to point directions for the future of social studies.

Irving Morrissett
Director, Project SPAN
Executive Director, Social Science
Education Consortium

AN INTRODUCTION TO PROJECT SPAN

Project SPAN undertook the task of describing and assessing the current and recent state of social studies/social science education, of designating desired states to which social studies might or should aspire, and of shaping recommendations as to how those desired states might be approached. This has been a formidable task, increasing in difficulty as the project moved from describing the current state to envisioning desired states to framing recommendations.

In describing the current state of social studies/social science education, the project began with three coordinated studies of science education supported by the National Science Foundation during the period 1976-78: a series of case studies conducted by the Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation at the University of Illinois, a national survey conducted by the Research Triangle Institute, and a survey of literature for the period 1955-75, conducted by The Ohio State University with the assistance of the Social Science Education Consortium. These three studies, using three very different but congruent methodologies, provide a wealth of information about precollege education in natural science, mathematics, and social studies/social science education. In addition to these three fruitful sources, SPAN staff and consultants reviewed hundreds of other documents bearing on social studies and, through correspondence and at conferences, sought the advice and comments of many persons throughout the nation.

With respect to the specification of desired states and of recommendations for achieving them, the basic fact of social studies education at present is that there is a great diversity of opinion, from which it is impossible to elicit consensus. There are polar positions on the most basic issues, and a range of opinion between the poles. Some feel that social studies is in need of drastic revision, others that there is little or no need for concern.

The great diversity of opinion about desired states and recommendations that exists in the literature and in the opinions of social studies educators throughout the nation, as experienced by SPAN staff members in perusing the literature, in numerous meetings and conversations, and in voluminous correspondence, was also reflected in the twelve consultants who worked with the SPAN staff throughout the project. The twelve consultants were chosen for their known contributions to social studies literature and practice, also for their representativeness of various social studies roles: elementary or secondary teacher, consultant or supervisor at district or state level, professional association, university teacher. They were indeed "representative"--not only of social-studies-educator roles but also of a wide range of opinions about desired states and recommendations!

Given this diversity of opinion, both in the social studies field at large and within the group of consultants, the SPAN staff (within which there were also some differences of opinion!) had to take the ultimate responsibility for formulating the statements concerning desired states and recommendations. We wish to give full credit for information and ideas we have borrowed and used--borrowed both from the consultants and from social studies educators at large. But the staff must accept final responsibility for the content of the SPAN reports.

The staff members who worked with SPAN throughout the project are Irving Morrissett, project director and executive director of the Social Science Education Consortium, Douglas Superka, associate project director and staff associate of SSEC, and Sharryl Hawke, staff associate of SSEC. Bruce Tipple, a staff associate of SSEC, also served as a staff member during the early part of the project, as did three teacher associates of SSEC, Maria Rydstedt, John Zola, and William Cleveland.

Two individuals produced commissioned papers at the request of the project staff. Dana Kurfman reviewed the status of evaluation processes in social studies and made recommendations on needed changes. Hazel W. Hertzberg wrote an extensive review of social studies reform efforts from 1880 to 1980.

The consultants who worked with SPAN throughout the project are:

Lee F. Anderson
Professor of Political Science
Northwestern University

Mary Vann Eslinger
Social Studies Consultant
North Carolina State Department
of Education

John D. Haas
Professor of Education
University of Colorado

Jarrell W. McCracken
Teacher of Social Studies
Manual High School
Denver,

Fred M. Newmann
Professor of Curriculum
and Instruction
University of Wisconsin

Elizabeth A. Dickie-Pellett
Social Studies Consultant
Los Angeles County Schools

R. Beery
Social Studies Consultant
Rochester (Minnesota) Public
Schools

Verna S. Fancett
Social Studies Teacher Emeritus
Fayetteville, New York

James G. Lengel
Social Studies Consultant
Vermont State Department of
Education

John U. Michaelis
Professor Emeritus of Education
University of California, Berkeley

John J. Patrick
Professor of Education
Indiana University

Roosevelt Ratliff
Associate Director for
Affiliated Units
Association for Supervision
and Curriculum Development

This publication is one of a series of reports of Project SPAN.

CONTENTS

PREFACE xi

1. SOCIAL STUDIES--MEANINGS AND BEGINNINGS. 1
   Definitions. 1
   Historical Background. 3
   The Professional Societies 6
   NEA--The Committee of Ten. 8
   AHA--The Committee of Seven. 12
   From History to Social Studies 17
   More Professional Societies. 19

2. THE 1916 REPORT AND THE 1920S. 25
   The NEA Committee on the Social Studies. 25
   The Schafer Committee. 30
   Growth of Specialization 32
   The National Council for the Social Studies. 35

3. THE AHA COMMISSION ON THE SOCIAL STUDIES AND THE 1930S 43
   The Commission 43
   From The Historical Outlook to Social Education. 53
   The Decline and Recovery of NCSS 54
   Active Citizenship Education: The Educational Policies Commission 56
   Curricular Fusion. 56
   The Progressive Education Association. 59

4. WORLD WAR II--THE 1940S AND 1950S. 65
   Historians and the Role of History in the Social Studies 65
   The Indifference of the Other Professional Associations. 72

World War II and Citizenship Education. 74
Citizenship Education Projects: Detroit and Columbia. 77
Core Curriculum 79
Changing Reform Characteristics 81

5. THE ORIGINS OF THE "NEW SOCIAL STUDIES" IN THE 1950S. 85
The 1950s--Rumblings and Reform 85
The New Critique of the Schools 85
"Consensus History"--a New View of America's Past 87
Arthur Bestor--History vs. Social Studies 89
NCSS Responses to the Critics 93
Beginnings of the "New" Curricular Reforms. 96

6. THE "NEW SOCIAL STUDIES". 101
Social Studies Curricular Reform--Private and Public Support. . 101
Debate on New Directions for Social Studies 103
Project Social Studies--and Others. 108
The "New Social Studies" in Local Curriculum Guides 109
Critiques of the "New Social Studies" 111
Lessons From the "New Social Studies" 115

7. A NEW MOVEMENT: RELEVANCE, ACTIVISM, AND IDENTITY. 121
1968--a Turning Point 121
Black History 123
Renewal of Citizenship Education. 126
Other Problems and Methods. 130
The 1971 NCSS Guidelines. 132
Reviews of "New Social Studies" Projects. 136
A Summary View of the 1970s 138
Citizenship Education--Renewed Again. 139

8. TAKING STOCK. 145
History in the 1970s. 145
Multiethnic Education 147
The 1979 NCSS Guidelines. 153
Alarms and Surveys. 153
NSF Studies and the NCSS Review 157

9. SUMMARY AND COMMENT 165
Neglect of School and Classroom Realities 165

The Need for Historical Perspective 169
The Need for a Comparative Perspective 170
The Social Studies in the Education of Citizens. 171
Student Learning 173
The Social Studies and the Disciplines 175
The Social Studies and the Learned Societies 177
Curricular Scope and Sequence. 178
The 1980s? 180

NAME INDEX. 185

SUBJECT INDEX 189

PREFACE

What has come to be known as "the social studies" evolved during the last hundred years out of a loose and sometimes quarrelsome federation of half a dozen related school subjects. Even as the process went on, the purposes, methodologies, and curricula of the social studies came under examination, and they were accompanied by periodic national reform movements.

In this study I deal with these movements, particularly as they sought to reform the social studies curricula of the secondary schools. My purpose is not simply to write a history but also to provide a useful background for current efforts to reform the social studies.

Two cautionary generalizations should be kept in mind in reading this history.

First, beware of reinventions of the wheel. The reform movements engaged the talents of many brilliant educators. But too often they "discovered" things that had been discovered earlier and then forgotten. There is no reason why what has been rediscovered should not be retried, but it would be valuable to know what happened the first time. Wheels reinvented are often wheels spun.

Second, reform advocated is not necessarily reform accomplished. I advisedly use the term "national" rather than "classroom" reform. As yet we know little about the impact of proposed reforms in the thousands of classrooms where the social studies are actually taught and learned by live teachers and pupils. No matter how eloquently and cogently articulated, reforms advocated by remote national groups have to deal with the daily realities of the classroom. We don't even know whether national reform precedes or follows classroom experimentation. Failure to recognize these inadequacies in the historical record can be mischie-

vous. It has caused reformers to assume successes and critics to rail at reformers under the shared delusion that a set of reforms has been widely implemented in the schools.

Each generation has its own choices to make, and history should indeed be "a guide, not a dictator." But in our eagerness to avoid dictation we often ignore guidance that can help us meet the challenges of the future successfully.

I would like to thank Denise O'Grady, Bradley Rudin, and Jack Kurty, my research assistants at Teachers College, for their competent and cheerful help. I would also like to thank Sidney Hertzberg for his editorial comments. Mary O. Furner read the manuscript and offered many helpful suggestions for which I am deeply grateful. Irving Morrissett asked me to do this study, and I thank him for the suggestion and the opportunity. I am also grateful to Project SPAN of the Social Science Education Consortium, of which Dr. Morrissett is the director, and to the National Science Foundation, which supported the project.

This paper is based on a book now in progress.

Hazel Whitman Hertzberg
Professor of History and
Education
Teachers College
Columbia University

New York City
July 1981

1. SOCIAL STUDIES--MEANINGS AND BEGINNINGS

Definitions

What is--or are--the social studies?

The term began to be used early in the century, during the progressive period, when it defined a well-established curriculum encompassing history, civics or government, and to a lesser extent economics and sociology. No doubt convenience--the need for an inclusive name--played a role in its adoption. But far more important was the climate of the time. "Social" was one of the most popular adjectives in the lexicon of reform: social betterment, social gospel, social efficiency, social surveys, social settlement, social control, social education, even socialized recitation--these were some of its many uses. The center of gravity in history, itself the curricular centerpiece, was shifting toward history that "speaks to the present"--social and modern history under the influence of the "new history" as championed by such men as James Harvey Robinson and Charles A. Beard. The term "social studies" thus had a distinct air of social betterment about it. Its use spread rapidly in the late teens and the twenties, largely because of the influence of the 1916 report of the National Education Association Committee on the Social Studies.

What "the social studies" actually referred to has remained somewhat ambiguous. Edgar B. Wesley, one of the leaders of the social studies movement, defined the term crisply as "the social sciences simplified for pedagogical purposes."[1] This conception is the one that has been most commonly held throughout the history of the social studies. The social sciences thus simplified have always included his-

tory, some form of political science, and at various times geography, economics, sociology, anthropology, and psychology. Nevertheless, history has not been universally regarded as a social science, and political science has been adapted not only as civil government but also as "civics," a subject which has frequently drawn on economics and sociology as well--in both cases reflecting changes in the various disciplines themselves. The "pedagogical purposes" in Wesley's definition include attention to the needs of society and of students. When the term was being popularized, "social studies" often designated introductory college courses as a form of general education.

A second definition of the social studies envisions a unitary field comprising a fusion of materials drawn from the disciplines but ignoring disciplinary boundaries and organized around the needs of society, of students, or of some combination thereof. While much less common in practice than Wesley's definition, this conception has been important in the literature of reform and was most usually implemented in the junior high school. Some versions of the core curriculum and the life adjustment curriculum exemplify this definition. Their proponents have frequently asserted that only such a fused field could claim to be the genuine article. However, the impulse to fusion has not been peculiar to the effort to create a unitary field disregarding the disciplines. In the course of their evolution, material from all the disciplines intermingled, history being the most eclectic of all. Both the first and the second definitions have normally included attention to the scope and sequence of the social studies curriculum.

A third definition of the social studies is so inclusive as to empty it of useful meaning. It designates almost any school subject as a "social study" provided it is somehow related to social purposes or social utility. Rarely used today, this enveloping notion was more common in the 1920s and 1930s. Perhaps the recent back-to-basics movement is related to this definition, in intent if not in terminology, by defining certain subjects as "basic" in their social or individual utility.

A fourth definition uses the terms "social sciences" and "social studies" virtually interchangeably. It emphasizes the social science

part of Wesley's definition while playing down or ignoring his "pedagogical purposes." The assumption is that learning basic concepts and research methodologies of the several disciplines is sufficient. This definition tends to focus almost exclusively on the individual disciplines and to ignore both their relationships and the problem of scope and sequence in the social studies curriculum. During the pre-social-studies days of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, the strict-constructionist version of the source study movement in history took this approach. The "new social studies" movement of the 1960s shared it to a moderate extent.

Such are the leading definitions of the term "social studies." But long before the term came into general use, constituent parts of the social studies were taught in the schools. That they were taught in combination should occasion no surprise. During most of the 19th century the disciplines were only hazily distinguished from each other, and they lacked the professional self-consciousness and the professional organizations that characterized their development in the late 19th and 20th centuries. History was combined with the classics, geography with history, history with civil government, history or geography or civil government with reading, and so on.

Historical Background

The 1880s were a seed-time for the remarkable growth of the public high school and the forces that shaped its curriculum. The United States had only recently recovered from the trauma of the Civil War and Reconstruction; henceforward it would be not two nations, but one. Industrialization and mass transportation were growing rapidly. Streams of immigrants flowed into the country. Men and women sought their fortunes in cities as well as on western frontiers. Powerful new ideas and institutions arose, and old ideas and institutions were modified or transformed to meet the exigencies of the new age. The public schools, historically conceived as essential to the future of a democratic society, were bound to become one arena in which this transformation would take place.

At the opening of the 1880s, some of the subjects comprising the social studies were fairly widespread in the secondary schools. Data

are hard to come by, partly because the decentralization of the American school system hampered the gathering of statistics; but what information is available is suggestive. At the opening of the 1880s, only 4 percent of the pupils in the Ohio "common schools" (elementary and secondary) took history, mostly American history but also some "general history." Only percentage figures are available on high schools offering history in the North Central states between 1876 and 1885. Of the schools reporting, half offered "general" history, 30 percent ancient history, 25 percent American history, 25 percent English history, 15 percent modern history, 10 percent "outlines of history," and 5 percent medieval, "universal," and state history, respectively. The number of pupils actually enrolled is not known.[2] The adjectives "general," "universal," and "outlines" probably indicated similar courses. For civil government the data are even less satisfactory. In Ohio in 1882, slightly more than 5 percent of the pupils "pursued" the "science of government," and only about 1 percent of the students took "political economy" (later economics).[3] According to the fragmentary statistical evidence, history, civil government, and political economy were not major school subjects, a circumstance well recognized at the time.

How, then, did the future social studies become so important by the time of the 1916 NEA report? It was in the fateful 1880s that three forces combined to set the stage for the development of the social studies: the rise of the public high school, the rise of the university, and the emergence of national agencies of reform connected with both.[4]

Sometime in the 1880s, enrollment in public high schools overtook that in private high schools, including the academy, thereafter continuing a spectacular growth in which the number of students doubled each decade. The public high school--free, open to all, operating under public control, and financed from public taxation--was essentially an American invention, an extension of the publicly controlled common school system to the higher grades. Secondary education in Europe, although differing sharply from country to country in the degree of centralized direction and ecclesiastical control or influence, was a two-class affair, with one type of education for leadership and the professions and another for followership and vocational training.

European curricula and educational ideas influenced the American high school, but their influence was brought to bear on an institution radically different in intent and inclusiveness.

The public high school was popularly known as "the people's college." An increasing, although still relatively small, number of pupils aspired to high school attendance and even graduation, although completing "the grades" still represented the extent of the hopes of most parents and pupils. Most high schools were coeducational, and in fact more girls than boys attended. From both high school and academy only a tiny minority went on to college. Nevertheless, secondary schools had somehow to provide for both college-bound students and the vast majority whose formal education ended there. This dual function, coupled with the problem of wildly divergent higher-education entrance requirements, made reconsideration of the curriculum virtually inevitable.

The second factor--the growth of the university--challenged the curriculum of both high school and college. The university was the great new factor in higher education, as the high school was in lower education.[5] The Morrill Act of 1862, which provided endowments from public lands, stimulated the growth of public colleges and universities, particularly in the Middle West. Some private colleges, such as Harvard and Yale, began to move toward university status. Two great leaders of the university movement--Cornell (founded in 1868) and Johns Hopkins (founded in 1876)--exemplified differing varieties of the university ideal. By the 1880s, the university was exerting a growing influence in American education.

The American university was the German university transplanted, but, as was the case with many other European importations, it was transformed in the process. In increasing numbers, young historians and other scholars who sought in Germany an advanced education not available at home returned to their native land imbued with the twin ideals of scientific research and practical public service. In a rapidly developing country with more people, more industry, more cities, more opportunity, and a democratic ethos, higher education could either be bypassed, as frequently happened, or drastically changed. The old-time college with its classical curriculum and its religious orthodoxy could not remain undisturbed.

The upshot was a battle between the "classics"--Latin, Greek, and mathematics--and "the moderns"--English, history, modern languages, and science. In general, the conflict in higher education ranged the universities on one side as advocates of "the moderns" and the colleges on the other as defenders of "the classics"--though "the moderns" made serious inroads in the colleges, while the classics were also taught in the universities, which by definition were eclectic. In secondary education the division was less clear-cut. Many academies offered "the moderns," while typically high schools had two programs: "classical" and "English" (the moderns).

History was allied with the "new subjects" while retaining respectable ties to the old, where it was often part of the classics. The rising generation of German-trained historians considered themselves "scientific" while still retaining deep roots in a literary tradition. By "scientific" they meant the use of primary or original sources in research and the careful testing and weighing of evidence--"the historical method"--to construct a narrative setting forth "what really happened" in which the facts "spoke for themselves." The seminar was the educational vehicle for this process and the university its home. Unlike the great patrician amateur historians of the 19th century, the new professionals required an institutional base. Their links both to the older tradition and to science through "scientific" history gave them powerful leverage which they used to promote the university ideal of scientific research and to secure a place for "scientific" graduate training beyond the natural sciences. At the same time they sought to implement the ideal of public service and to relate history to the improvement of the social order. The schools, traditionally conceived as essential to a democratic society, were a natural focus of interest.

The Professional Societies

The emergence of professional societies in the late 19th century is the third factor in the rise of the future social studies. History was the first of the incipient social sciences to produce a separate professional association. The symbolic birth of the historical profession was the founding in 1884 of the American Historical Association. The AHA was organized at the annual meeting of the American Social Science

Association, the chief body encompassing the social sciences, then only vaguely distinguished from each other. The ASSA, which had a distinguished and diverse membership, was committed to both social reform and scientific inquiry. The AHA promptly declared its independence of its parent and proceeded to unite the new professionals, the older patrician amateurs, and men of affairs with a broad interest in history. From the beginning the new professionals were in charge, though for two decades the amateurs and professionals were represented equally in the executive council and the president was usually an amateur.[6] This inclusiveness helped to avoid the acrimony that accompanied the professionalization of some of the other social science disciplines, and it nourished a civic-minded interest in the relationship of history to American society.

The chief founder of the AHA and its secretary for almost two decades was Herbert Baxter Adams, one of the new German-trained professionals who nevertheless cultivated the older historians, historical societies, and others broadly interested in history. Adams, who in effect was the AHA between the leisurely annual conventions, championed education at all levels, teaching as well as research. He wrote extensively on the teaching of history in schools and colleges, started a series of influential research monographs at Johns Hopkins, conducted his famous seminar there which produced a stellar generation of historians and incipient social scientists, and kept up a brisk and wide-ranging correspondence. Adams contributed to the first "methods" book in the social studies, edited by the famous psychologist G. Stanley Hall, Methods of Teaching and Studying History (1883). He had a particular interest in the education of women, perhaps as a result of a teaching stint at Smith College. If the interest of the historical profession in the teaching of history could be attributed to any single individual, it would certainly be Herbert Baxter Adams.

A second professional social science organization, founded in 1885 (again at the ASSA meeting), was the American Economic Association, led by Richard T. Ely, the German-trained son of a Presbyterian minister and Adams's colleague at Johns Hopkins.[7] Ely represented the rising school of institutional economists who believed that economic truths were relative rather than absolute, favored state intervention in the economy, and envisioned economics as an ethical science which could help bring

about needed social reforms. Opposed to this school were the strict neoclassical laissez-faire economists, who were committed to immutable economic laws and who harbored a deep distrust of governmental intervention. These warring camps obviously reflected deep divisions in American society.

Uniting the two factions of economists in one professional association would have been a formidable and perhaps impossible task in the mid-1880s under the most favorable circumstances. But Ely never made the effort. He was determined to exclude the laissez-faire "Sumner crowd" led by Charles Sumner of Yale. He succeeded all too well. Despite efforts at compromise, the platform of the fledgling organization reflected the views of the institutional economists and thus emerged as the voice of one school of economic thought. The laissez-faire neoclassicists and even some moderate conservatives boycotted the AEA, which then attracted a broader representation of reformers, including a healthy contingent of ministers, than of economists. Unlike the historians, the AEA economists were unable to appropriate the cachet of science, which came close to being captured by their laissez-faire adversaries. Not until 1892 was the quarrel patched up, resulting in the retirement of Ely as secretary and an official and restrictive definition of the economist's role, confined to authoritative judgment on economic but not ethical questions. Ely as well as laissez-faire advocates wrote on the teaching of economics, but neither could claim to speak for the profession as a whole. Thus, at a critical point, the second professional association of social scientists was effectively removed from the possibility of having an important impact on the curriculum.

After the founding of the AHA and the AEA, there followed a lull of almost two decades in the formation of learned societies in the social sciences. Not until the opening years of the 20th century did a new wave of professional associations in the social studies arise. By this time, however, a curricular direction had been set.

NEA--The Committee of Ten

It was the National Education Association, the most important of the reform agencies, that took the lead in setting the curriculum.

Founded in 1857, it was reborn in 1884 when its energetic executive secretary succeeded in transforming the annual convention of a few hundred faithful into an exuberant outpouring of some 5,000 people.[8] The NEA encompassed all of education, from elementary school through the college and university, and was thus the logical group to consider the relationships of the various levels of education to each other. In 1887, the National Council of the NEA resolved to study the controversial problem of uniformity between high school programs and college entrance requirements.

The eventual result was the report of the Committee of Ten, the first of a bewildering profusion of numerically named committees. It was headed by President Charles Eliot of Harvard, who as an apostle of the elective system favored both the classics and the moderns.[9] The work of the Committee of Ten constituted the first national effort to suggest a curricular pattern for the high school. Its report did not settle the question to which it was initially assigned, but instead declared that the primary purpose of the high school was not to prepare students for college but to give a good education to the vast majority of students whose formal education ended with high school.

For the future social studies, the heart of the matter was the report of the Conference on History, Civil Government, and Political Economy, one of nine such committees of ten members each covering various classical and modern subjects. Geography was included with geology and meteorology, and was thus officially detached from the social subjects. The History Ten, chaired by Charles Kendall Adams, president of the University of Wisconsin, with Albert Bushnell Hart of Harvard as secretary (both were German-trained professionals), met at Madison, Wisconsin, December 28-30, 1892. Woodrow Wilson, then a young professor of jurisprudence and political economy at Princeton College, played a key role in the proceedings. James Harvey Robinson, who a quarter of a century later would be the chief mentor of the 1916 NEA Committee, was a member. All the then-recognized social sciences were represented. The Ten included four university men, three from the colleges, and three high school principals. Several of the members had had experience in the schools as teachers, superintendents, or board members.

The History Ten's recommendations were the same for all parts of the country, but were to be flexibly applied with due regard for local conditions. They were based on work already done in good schools, and they made no distinction between college-bound and non-college-bound students.[10]

The value and advantages of history and allied subjects when taught by "the newer methods" were, the committee declared, that they

> serve to broaden and cultivate the mind; that they counteract a narrow and provincial spirit; that they prepare the pupil in an eminent degree for enlightenment and intellectual enjoyment in after years; and that they assist him to exercise a salutary influence upon the affairs of his country.[11]

Thus did the report seek to balance cultural advantages to the individual with the citizenship needs of society. The "newer methods" included inquiry, extensive use of comparison, informal presentations supplemented by student presentations in the advanced grades, individualized work, field trips, debates, audiovisual aids, and so on, eschewing rote recitation from textbooks, extensive lecturing, and "historical catechism." Schools needed better textbooks containing social and economic as well as political materials, better libraries, and better teachers specially trained in content and method.

The recommended curriculum in history and allied subjects covered eight consecutive years, the last four years of elementary school and the four years of high school, representing a substantial increase in the time devoted to the social studies. For the last four years of the grades, the sequence was two years of biography and mythology, followed by a year of American history and government and a year of Greek and Roman history "with their Oriental connections." This would conclude elementary education--that is, most people's education. The high school sequence was French history, taught "to elevate the general movement of medieval and modern history," English history in the same framework, American history, and in the last year civil government and a "special period studied in an intensive manner."[12] The "special period" recommendation was a modest high school version of the seminar method, with some use of primary sources. The popular "general history" was rejected as "a mass of details" without relationships.[13] The committee also

rejected a separate course in political economy (economics), urging instead that its general principles be introduced functionally into history, geography, and civil government.[14] Civil government was to be taught separately in both elementary and high school, in the latter with "constant reference" to foreign systems.[15]

In essence, the report of the History Ten allied the future social studies subjects with the historic role of the schools in the education of citizens in a democratic society. It was longer and more eloquently argued than most of the other subcommittee reports, as befitted a field seeking to become established in the curriculum. In paying serious attention to improving methods and materials of instruction and the education of teachers, the History Ten addressed questions of moment to the schools. The curriculum they proposed included materials from economics, sociology, and political science, but provided for separate treatment of civil government. It was close enough to current school practice to be practical, and it articulated the kinds of changes many schoolmen called for.

The overall report of the Committee of Ten aroused furious controversy, thereby stimulating further interest in the curriculum. However, the report of the History Ten went relatively unscathed; the charge that it mainly attempted to foist college ideas on the schools was one made by later generations.

The report of the History Ten was duly discussed at the 1894 meeting of the American Economic Association, which then included both economists and sociologists. By this time the two wings of warring economists had been uneasily united, only to have a further controversy erupt among and between economists and sociologists. The latter were included in the AEA but were moving toward a separate professional identity. All the disputants were rooted in the social evolutionary theories of Herbert Spencer, but they interpreted them differently. Sociologists sought to make sociology the broad synthesizing discipline but disagreed on how this synthesis should be arrived at, some approaching the matter inductively, some deductively. Many economists, on the other hand, had no intention of allowing economics to be a sub-branch of sociology. The various positions passionately set forth at an earlier session spilled over into the meeting that discussed the report of the

Committee of Ten. The discussion revealed little agreement on the place of economics in the school curriculum or even on whether it should be included at all. In the end, most economists and sociologists seemed to favor the recommendations of the History Ten.[16] Although both institutional and laissez-faire partisans continued to advocate the teaching of economics as a separate subject in the schools, they did so without the support or in many cases even the interest of their fellow professionals, most of whom viewed economics as far too arcane for young minds.

AHA--The Committee of Seven

It is difficult to measure the impact of the History Ten on the schools, but probably the increase in school history and the inroads into the "rote" system can be attributed at least partially to its work.[17] Of equal if not more importance was the role of the committee in the establishment of a relationship between the profession and the schools at a time when important changes were taking place within the AHA. In the 1890s there was a decided shift in the balance between professionals and amateurs, with the tilt decisively toward the latter. This change strengthened rather than lessened historical interest in the schools. When the secretary of the NEA's Secondary Education Department requested the AHA to make recommendations on the still-unresolved question of college entrance requirements, the association responded by setting up its famous Committee of Seven, whose final report, like the NEA Ten's, went considerably beyond what it had been asked to do. The Seven spent three years working on one of the most influential reports in the history of the social studies.[18]

The Committee of Seven was an extraordinarily able group, with broad experience in education. Andrew C. McLaughlin was chairman. The other members were Herbert Baxter Adams, George L. Fox, Albert Bushnell Hart, Charles Homer Haskins, Lucy M. Salmon, and H. Morse Stephens. As a group they were young (Hart, the eldest, was 46; Haskins, the youngest, was 26). They were well launched on their professional careers although they had not yet attained the eminence most were to achieve in the affairs of the AHA, as research scholars and as writers of history. Two had served as public school superintendents; four had been high

school teachers or principals; one had taught at a normal school. All were products of universities and four had done graduate work in Europe. All were known as outstanding teachers. Lucy Salmon was the first woman to be named to a national curricular committee in the social sciences.

The Seven epitomized a time in the development of the historical profession when commitment to research was united with a commitment to civic enterprise, and specialization was part of rather than separate from a synthesizing view of history. They believed in the value of history as general education for citizens, and they wrote history for the public as well as for specialists. Education in the high schools was not a remote affair which they approached from the outside; rather, it was woven into the fabric of their own experience. The Seven shared a confidence in the future of their country and the value of its past, a confidence at once critical and profound.

The Seven set about their work by surveying American, French, English, and German education. From their on-the-scene foreign investigations, the main positive "lessons" derived were the needs for trained teachers and for more time for history instruction. There were negative lessons as well: German and French schools regarded pupils as subjects rather than citizens, while English instruction was chaotic and entirely lacking in attention to civil government. Having limited faith in surveys, the Seven also met with teachers and teacher associations. From their study of American schools and teachers, they drew heavily on exemplary curricula and teaching methods already in use.

Like the Ten, the Seven believed the high school should serve the purpose "of developing boys and girls into men and women," rather than fitting them for college.[19] History was "peculiarly appropriate for a secondary course, which is fashioned with the thought of preparing boys and girls for the duties of daily life and intelligent citizenship."[20] Education should help them acquire "some appreciation of the nature of the state and society, some sense of the duties and responsibilities of citizenship, some capacity in dealing with political and social questions, something of the broad and tolerant spirit which is bred by the study of past times and conditions."[21] History, the Seven believed, was a synthesizing subject which could give "unity, continuity, and strength to the curriculum" by unfolding over a period of years as the pupils'

minds and capacities unfold. This synthesizing and enlarging process could not be achieved by bits and pieces of information from distinct subjects. The Seven believed that the study of civil government was essential but not sufficient; it was too static, too presentist, too concerned with existing institutions. Students needed to understand "that society is in movement, that what one sees about him is not the eternal but the transient, and that in the process of change virtue must be militant if it is to be triumphant."[22] No "conscious advance" or "working reform can be secured without both a knowledge of the present and an appreciation of how forces have worked in the social and political organizations of former times," the committee argued.[23] Further values of history set forth were the cultivation of judgment (linking cause with effect, offering opportunities for differing opinions, and balancing probabilities); training in the power not only of getting information but, more important, of using it; development of "the scientific habit of mind" (open-minded inquiry without prejudice, investigation before conclusion); inspiration from "the great and noble acts and struggles of by-gone men"; and the kindling of imagination.[24] History was thus to be dynamic, open-minded, concerned with critical thinking, active, and inspirational.

The curriculum proposed by the Seven was as follows:

First year--ancient history, especially Greek and Roman but also the "more ancient nations," including the early Middle Ages, ending in the fourth century.

Second year--medieval and modern European history, from the close of the first period to the present.

Third year--English history.

Fourth year--American history and civil government.[25]

The report discussed alternative approaches to each of these courses, stressing the need for some principle of unity which would allow for definite concrete treatment, while avoiding both philosophical generalization and tangled and meaningless accounts of detailed events. Political, social, and economic affairs should be included with attention to the lives of ordinary men and women as well as the fortunes of institutions, states, and empires. The Seven argued for a historical and contextual approach, rather than what would later be called a "social sciences" approach, to economics and government.

The Seven devoted considerable attention to method. They advocated the use of a good text to help achieve continuity and coherence; written work using several books and a variety of narratives and viewpoints; inquiry; what a later generation would call critical thinking; an end to rote memorization and rote recitation; audiovisual aids, especially maps; collateral reading, and correlation with other subjects. Good libraries and excellent teachers well trained in content and method were essential.

One section of the Seven's report was devoted to "source study," or the use of primary sources in teaching history. It rejected (though not by name) the strict-constructionist source-study method advocated by Fred Morrow Fling of the University of Nebraska. Fling prescribed a rigid series of steps by which students in his university classes and in the Nebraska schools developed a historical narrative almost exclusively from the sources. It was the German seminar method narrowly conceived and bereft of connection with civic enterprises. The Seven preferred the loose-constructionist view that saw the sources not as the major or only curricular base but as supplementary instruction, especially intensive study of a period and individualized work. Sources were useful for kindling the imagination, making the past real, and developing some understanding of the process of historical investigation. Sources were an insufficient basis for valuable generalization. Even historians drew on secondary materials for new points of view. The aim of historical study in the high school, the committee pointed out, was "the training of pupils, not so much in the art of historical investigation as in that of thinking historically." Even when one has learned to establish certain facts accurately, one may still be unable to understand their historical significance.[26]

The report of the Committee of Seven was hardly a radical departure from that of the History Ten. The Seven adjusted the Ten's recommended curriculum to bring it closer to school practices and to broaden it and make it more clearly developmental. Both committees attempted to accommodate the incipient social sciences. The Seven discussed methods, textbooks, and teacher training in more detail and dealt with the developmental needs of students more extensively and perhaps with more sensitivity. Both attempted to ground their recommendations in school reali-

ties, and both were highly respectful of classroom teachers. Each called for flexibility and adaptation to local conditions. Both emphasized the value of history and allied subjects for citizenship, but the Seven put the case more emphatically and at greater length.

The curriculum recommended by the AHA Committee of Seven was probably the most influential in the history of the social studies, if influence is measured by extent of adoption. A 1914-1915 study of 1,719 high schools reported that about 85 percent offered ancient history, 80 percent medieval and modern, 64 percent English, and 86 percent American history. General history, rejected by both the Ten and the Seven, was offered in barely .05 percent of the schools. Even more startling was the evidence that history had moved from an elective to a required subject, with 60 percent requiring American, 53 percent ancient, 43 percent medieval and modern, and 27 percent English.[27] Encouraged by the reception of the Committee of Seven report, the AHA in 1905 appointed a Committee of Eight to recommend a curriculum for the elementary schools, which included civics. Its report, issued in 1909, appears to have had a somewhat similar influence, especially in establishing a new course in Old World or European backgrounds of American history in grade 6. For the other grades, the committee recommended Indian life, historical aspects of Thanksgiving, the story of Washington, and local events for grades 1 and 2; heroes of other times, Columbus, the Indians, and historical aspects of July 4th for grade 3; a biographical approach to American history in grades 4 and 5; and a chronological approach in grades 7 and 8. The committee also suggested a parallel program in elementary civics, which emphasized state and national governments, in grades 7 and 8.

The significance of the Committee of Seven's report goes beyond its curricular successes. The report cemented a connection between the historical profession and the schools which continued for decades. Produced by the new professionals, it helped to ensure a leading place for history in the future social studies and to create a tradition which became seriously attenuated only after World War II.

From History to Social Studies

The decade and a half between the Seven's report and that of the 1916 NEA Committee on the Social Studies was a period of intense reform activity in American life. Progressivism--that vast and sprawling movement containing many conflicting tendencies--was rising at the beginning of the century and would reach its peak in the following decade, at just about the time when the school subjects collectively known as "history" would become "the social studies." In education, two major streams of thought were entwined with the rise of progressivism as it affected the social studies. The first was "social efficiency" and the second social history, or the "new history."

In the education of citizens, "social efficiency," like "social studies," was an ambiguous term open to various interpretations. At one pole of meaning stood David Snedden, an educational sociologist and administrator, who was strongly influenced by the sociologists Herbert Spencer and Edward A. Ross. The latter's doctrine of social control inspired Snedden's own extreme version. Taking the juvenile reform school as his educational model, Snedden conceived of all schools as unparalleled instruments of social control, hierarchically organized, scientifically managed, offering separate education for "producers" ("the rank and file"), who were to receive a vocational education, and "consumers," who were to receive Snedden's version of a liberal education. He favored the use of specific objectives, "scientifically" determined and applied, to which content would be rigorously tailored and by which the outcomes of instruction would be judged. Snedden developed a particular antipathy to history. It would be difficult to imagine an approach more at odds with that of the Committees of Ten and Seven.[29]

At the opposite pole was the educational philosopher John Dewey, who took an idealized community as his model for the school, looking to a society that would be "worthy, lovely, and harmonious." The school would be permeated with "the spirit of art, history, and science," saturating the child with "the spirit of service" and "providing him with the instruments of self-direction."[30] In building the open and democratic society that he envisioned, Dewey asserted that social efficiency in the broadest sense was "nothing less than the socialization of

mind which is actively concerned in making experiences more communicable; in breaking down the barriers of social stratification which make individuals impervious to the interests of others." Dewey warned that, detached from such purposes, social efficiency and even social science were "hard and metallic things."[31]

Dewey and Snedden expressed educational versions of different tendencies in progressivism. In between, there were other varieties of social efficiency. Many people who favored specific, scientific objectives, for example, opposed Snedden's differentiated education--with separate schools for producers and consumers--as undemocratic. In whatever version, the doctrine of social efficiency became and remained a major influence on education and a continuing element of controversy. As we shall see, social studies reformers used the doctrine but tended to express a version closer to Dewey's than to Snedden's.

Within the historical profession there was developing at the same time a school known as the "new history." If social efficiency represented educational versions of progressive reform, the "new history" was progressivism manifest in the historical profession. James Harvey Robinson, who had been a member of the History Ten and was a leader of the movement, published his manifesto, The New History, in 1912, but the movement had begun much earlier. Frederick Jackson Turner, Charles A. Beard, and many other rising young historians were part of this school. John Dewey, a close associate of Robinson at Columbia, was deeply sympathetic to it, and this was the history he advocated for the schools.

History, the "new historians" believed, should speak to and illuminate the present. They favored "recent" (the last two or three hundred years) over ancient history and sought in the past not precedents of conduct but explanations for how the present came to be. "Historical mindedness," they believed, was vitally needed for social progress. They stood for a history broadened far beyond "past politics," one that would investigate the conditions of everyday life, the history of industry and of work, social and economic as well as political change, and "the common man" as well as prominent leaders. The "new historians" advocated intellectual history, the history of thought, as a potent and necessary way of promoting the intellectual liberty upon which they believed progress fundamentally depended. They sought an alliance with

the rising social sciences, not to remake themselves into social scientists, but to suggest new viewpoints and interpretations. The "new historians," with their commitment to social progress, social science, and education, were ideally suited to meeting the need of a history in the schools which was appropriate to a progressive age. Nor were they quite as far from the older "scientific" historians as they imagined. Social history was far older than the "new history" and had been written by some "scientific" historians. Both schools of thought believed in progress and civic responsibility; both sought some measure of objectivity as an ideal to be cherished if not attained. Neither attempted to define itself as "scientific" in the manner of the social sciences.

More Professional Societies

The chief organizational vehicle for social studies curricular reform in the first two decades of the century was a cluster of regional history teachers' associations. Arising directly from the work of the AHA Committee of Seven, whose members helped to found and nourish them, they included school, college, normal school, and university teachers of history, government, civics, economics, and sociology. By the middle of the first decade of the 20th century, three major regional groups had been founded: the New England History Teachers Association (1897), the North Central History Teachers Association (1899), and the Association of History Teachers of the Middle States and Maryland (1904). The North Central Association became a section of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association (the present Organization of American Historians) in 1911. Of the three, the Middle States group seems to have exerted the most national influence. Together, they represented a substantial broadening of the base of support for curricular change in the "social" subjects, an arena in which new ideas in content and method were debated and a new consensus was reached, and a major source of curricular materials for the schools.

Although the regional teaching associations linked teachers of history and "allied subjects" at all levels of education, their primary focus was on the secondary school. They published syllabi, bibliographies, source books, teaching manuals, and other materials for the history courses recommended by the Committee of Seven and for economics and

government or civics. Many of the textbooks of the period were written by association leaders. The associations also investigated and made recommendations on textbooks, college entrance requirements, and courses of study. They debated methods and content in teaching the social subjects and articulation among them. Through their published proceedings, their debates reached a wider circle of teachers.

In 1909 the associations acquired an unofficial national periodical with the advent of the History Teachers Magazine, founded by the University of Pennsylvania historian Albert McKinley. (HTM would eventually evolve into Social Education.) Despite its excellence, the periodical had initial financial troubles, from which it was rescued by AHA sponsorship entailing an advisory committee headed by Henry Johnson of Teachers College, Columbia University. History Teachers Magazine provided a national forum for different views on social education, along with news of the regional associations, local teachers' groups, and learned societies, and it carried many articles on the content and teaching of the social subjects.

During the decade that opened with the founding of the teachers' associations and closed with the founding of a national magazine, three social sciences formed separate associations: the American Political Science Association (1903), the American Anthropological Association (1904), and the American Sociological Society (1907), later the American Sociological Association. Of the three, the APSA took the most interest in the schools, immediately setting up a department on instruction in government. An investigation by Professor W.A. Schafer of the University of Minnesota reported that high school graduates were deplorably ignorant of political science knowledge.[32] The result was the Committee of Five, with Paul S. Reinsch of the University of Wisconsin as chairman. Its report, issued in 1908, called for better-trained teachers and better instructional materials in the teaching of government.[33] The Five recommended civic instruction beginning in the grades, a separate course on government in the high school which was distinct from history, and an approach known as the "new civics," which involved a functional rather than formal approach to government. These emphases reflected professional interest and activity in municipal administration and practical questions of government. The bulk of the report expressed an

impassioned desire to assert independence from history. This preoccupation partly amounted to kicking in an open door. Through the AHA Committee of Eight (1909) on the elementary school, historians proposed a separate program in elementary civics, and an AHA Committee of Five which had been set up in 1907 to review the work of its Seven was moving rapidly toward reaffirming the 12th-grade separate government course which the History Seven had earlier recommended. Perhaps the historians were responding to the desires of the political scientists, but a more important reason was probably pressure from the teachers' associations. Both political scientists and historians (many of whom were interchangeable) responded to the progressive interest in government and civic reform.

The professionalization of anthropology seems to have had little direct impact on the schools. The anthropologists, preoccupied with their own professional interests, did not seek to influence the curriculum. Anthropology had indirectly affected the schools through the work of the American Herbartians, whose theories of successive cultural epochs were based on the 19th-century evolutionary anthropology, which the new professionals rejected. The sociologists, on the other hand, were interested in the role of the schools but not in the school curriculum. They were in the process of defining their field less globally. Most, like Albion Small, the founder of the ASS, considered the subject well beyond the capacities of high school students. Sociological concern was directed somewhat more to training the teachers who would teach the pupils. Sociology, like economics, developed modestly in the curriculum in the absence of, rather than as a result of, the interest or activity of professional associations.

Thus, among the social science professional associations, it was the historians and to a lesser extent the political scientists who devoted themselves to the curriculum and to teaching in the schools. In the teachers' associations, historians of both schools of historical thought provided a phalanx of college and university leadership persons of such diverse views as Charles McLean Andrews, a "scientific historian," and Charles A. Beard and James Harvey Robinson, standard bearers of the "new history." An astonishing number of the most productive professional historians of the day participated. Teachers from high

schools, normal schools, and occasionally elementary schools provided major leadership in the associations, in addition to college and university historians and political scientists.

There thus developed an influential network of teachers of history and other social subjects throughout most of the educational system. The associations sought to improve history teaching through better training programs and teacher certification requirements, by making history more "definite" and focused, and by asserting the purposes and value of the social subjects. The movement for specified, immediately observable outcomes of instruction does not seem to have made much headway in the associations, although the HTM carried an occasional article on "standards" for judging instructional outcomes.

By the opening of the second decade of the 20th century, opinion in the associations was shifting toward the "new history" and the "new civics." Despite--or perhaps because of--the rapid installation of the Committee of Seven's curricular recommendations, however, there was much dissatisfaction with them. The HTM warned that history was seriously jeopardized by "the new commercialism of the school" and the demand for "practical subjects," in an editorial calling upon historians "to set their own house in order if they do not wish it to be remodelled without their consent by outsiders."[34] No doubt interest in the "new history" and the "new civics" was spurred by these challenges. But it was the progressive spirit of the age which supported the "new history" and the "new civics." The current favoring recent history and social history also flowed strongly in the colleges, which were hardly under the same kinds of pressures for justification of the subject as were the schools. It was the spirit of the age which supported the "new history" and the "new civics."

By the mid-teens, there had emerged a broad consensus on the value of recent history--essentially the "new history"--on deemphasizing ancient history, on teaching community civics in the first year of high school or the late junior high school (a new and growing invention), on government as a separate subject in the last year of high school, and on the need for upgrading teacher training and certification. Most of the consensus would find its way into the influential 1916 NEA report of its Committee on the Social Studies.

References

1. Edgar B. Wesley, Teaching the Social Studies (New York: D.C. Heath, 1937), p. 6.

2. Rollo M. Tryon, The Social Sciences as School Subjects (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935), p. 134 (hereafter cited as Tryon).

3. Tryon, pp. 266, 342.

4. This account relies heavily on Edward A. Krug's indispensable two-volume history of the high school, The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920 and 1920-1941 (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1964, 1972). See also Lawrence A. Cremin, The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957 (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962).

5. See Laurence R. Veysey, The Emergence of the American University (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965).

6. John Higham, History (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965), pp. 1-25.

7. For the best discussion of the professionalization of the social sciences in general and economics in particular, see Mary O. Furner, Advocacy and Objectivity: A Crisis in the Professionalization of American Social Science, 1865-1905 (Lexington, Ky.: University Press of Kentucky, 1975).

8. Edgar B. Wesley, NEA: The First Hundred Years (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), pp. 256-261.

9. National Education Association, Report of the Committee on Secondary Social Studies (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1893).

10. Ibid., pp. 167-68.

11. Ibid., pp. 166-67.

12. Ibid., p. 163.

13. Ibid., p. 174.

14. Ibid., p. 165.

15. Ibid., p. 181.

16. "The Teaching of Economics in the Secondary Schools," Publications of the American Economic Association 10, no. 3 (1895), supplement.

17. Tryon, p. 12.

18. [American Historical Association], The Study of History in Schools (New York: Macmillan, 1899).

19. Ibid., p. 120.

20. Ibid., p. 122.

21. Ibid., p. 17.

22. Ibid., p. 19.

23. Ibid., p. 20.

24. Ibid., pp. 21-26.

25. Ibid., pp. 34-35.

26. Ibid., pp. 101-103.

27. Tryon, p. 26.

28. Ibid., pp. 27-31.

29. See Walter Drost, David Snedden and Education for Social Efficiency (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967).

30. John Dewey, The School and Society (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1899), p. 44.

31. John Dewey, Democracy and Education (New York: Macmillan, 1916), p. 141.

32. W.A. Schafer, "What Do Students Know About American Government, Before Taking College Courses in Political Science?," Proceedings of the American Political Science Association 2 (1905), pp. 207-228.

33. "Report by the Committee of Five of the American Political Science Association on Instruction in American Government in Secondary Schools," Proceedings of the American Political Science Association 5 (1908).

34. History Teachers Magazine 4 (April 1913), p. 3.

2. THE 1916 REPORT AND THE 1920S

The NEA Committee on the Social Studies

The NEA Committee on the Social Studies, whose report was probably the most influential in the history of the social studies, was part of a larger NEA effort known as the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education (CRSE). The latter grew out of the perennial effort to articulate college admissions and school curricula and soon developed into a full-scale consideration of the curriculum. As did the earlier Ten, CRSE appointed committees on the various school subjects, among them a "Committee on Social Studies in the Secondary Schools," headed by Thomas Jesse Jones, a sociologist and official of the U.S. Bureau of Education, who had been on the staff of Hampton Institute for blacks and a few Indians, where he taught "social studies." Jones was probably responsible for bequeathing this name to his committee; in any case it soon became the "Committee on the Social Studies."

The composition of the committee was significant. As eventually constituted, nine of the sixteen members were from the regional history teachers' associations, with Middle States members predominating. The other striking characteristic was the meager representation of colleges and universities. However, one university member was James Harvey Robinson, doyen of the "new history," a leader of the Middle States Association, and a former member of the NEA Committee of Ten and the AHA Committee of Five. Robinson proved to have a major intellectual influence on the report.

Aside from several preliminary statements, the first major result of the committee's work was the publication in 1915 of Arthur W. Dunn's The Teaching of Community Civics. Dunn, who became secretary of the

committee, was probably the person most influential in furthering community civics. Much of his 1915 publication was incorporated into the 1916 report, which proved to be the final one, although such was not the committee's intention.

The History Teachers Magazine carried the various statements of the NEA Committee on the Social Studies, including the 1916 report, without evoking comment on the confrontational challenge to history later attributed to the report. Teachers were quite accustomed to the position set forth in the report, much of which they had suggested themselves and which was staple fare at association meetings. Considering the composition of the NEA committee, this is not surprising. The 1916 report was taken seriously, but no more so than other national reports on teacher certification, definitions of history, and such matters. It became a landmark only in retrospect. At the time, it was one report among many. Perhaps this somewhat muted reaction was also due to the fact that three months after the report was published in full in The History Teachers Magazine, the United States entered World War I, eclipsing the discussion that might have ensued.

The NEA report defined the social studies as "those whose subject matter relates directly to the organization and development of human society, and to man as a member of social groups."[1] This definition, of course, bypassed the question of whether the social studies were to be a federation of subjects or a fusion of subjects around a central theme or themes. The recommendations, in fact, used both approaches.

There were no two ways about the dominant purposes of social studies education, however. "The keynote of modern education is 'social efficiency,'" the NEA committee declared, and "instruction in all subjects should contribute to this end." Whatever the value of social studies "from the point of view of personal culture," they fail in their most important function if they do not "contribute directly to the cultivation of social efficiency on the part of the pupil." Their "conscious and constant purpose" should be the "cultivation of good citizenship," beginning in the neighborhood and extending to the world community.[2]

The report recommended a six-year course consisting of two cycles, one for grades 7 and 8 of the elementary school and grade 9 of the high

school, or the junior high grades, and another for the senior high grades (10-12). These corresponded roughly in this committee's view to physiological periods in adolescence. Since many children completed school with the 6th grade, and another contingent departed in grades 8 and 9, the committee attempted to design fairly complete social study cycles for grades 7-9 and 10-12. A number of optional arrangements and readjustments within the cycles were suggested. The junior cycle consisted of geography, European history, American history, and civics, and the senior cycle of European history, American history, and "Problems of Democracy"--social, economic, and political.

The report dwelt lovingly on community civics, including in this term not simply local civics but a community civics approach to the state and nation as well as to the international community. In sum, the report stated, "Community civics is a course of training in citizenship, organized with reference to the pupils' immediate needs, rich in its historical, economic, and political relations, and affording a logical and pedagogically sound avenue of approach to the later social studies."[3]

The current history program was criticized on the grounds that it placed too much emphasis on ancient and American history, leaving the rest to chance. More attention should be given to European history, the committee urged. This would be accomplished by collapsing ancient history into a year's course which dealt with the ancient and Oriental civilizations to the end of the 17th century, including English history and American exploration, followed by a year or half-year of European history since then. Next would come American history and finally "Problems of Democracy," thus repeating the junior cycle.

The report urged a topical approach to history. The selection of a topic and time devoted to it should depend "not upon its relative proximity in time, nor yet its relative present importance from the adult or sociological point of view, but also and chiefly upon the degree to which such topic can be related to the present life interests of the pupil, or can be used by him in his present processes of growth."[4] In this italicized statement, the report combined the "new history" of Robinson with the pedagogy of Dewey, both of whom were liberally quoted in its pages. Together with community civics, it was this version of

social efficiency which triumphed in the report of the NEA Committee on the Social Studies, not the sterner stuff of Snedden.

American history, the committee suggested, should be taught so as to foster an intelligent patriotism and a keen sense of the responsibility of every citizen for national efficiency. In the teaching of both modern European and American history, due attention should be given to Latin America and to the Orient, especially China and Japan, as well as to major international problems.

The "Problems of Democracy" (POD) course, the invention of the committee, was in itself an answer to the rival claims of the social sciences, none of which, in the committee's view, was adapted to the requirements of secondary education. The solution was an approach that would look at actual problems, issues, or conditions "of vital importance to society and of immediate interest to the pupil" as "they occur in life, and in their several aspects, political, economic, and sociological." A committee which had started under a "social science" label ended up by abandoning the social sciences in favor of the social studies.

In history, the chief casualty was ancient history, which was considerably foreshortened. Under the committee's proposal, so the report argued, more rather than less time would be devoted to "the essentials of European history," while American history would be expanded to a year in the high school, a recommendation not made by earlier committees. In fact, history kept its integrity as a subject, albeit cast in the lineaments of the "new history." The formal study of government was transmuted into civics and POD. Essentially, the report expressed the consensus already arrived at by the history teachers' associations, giving it a coherent curricular form which allowed for considerable flexibility. As in the previous quarter-century, history with an expanded civics component remained as the curricular core. The report also advocated other measures favored by the associations, among them better preservice and inservice training and better materials of instruction.

The overall report of CRSE appeared two years later in 1918 during World War I.[5] The "seven cardinal principles" which represented the main goals of education were health, command of fundamental processes (reading, writing, and arithmetic), worthy home-membership, vocation,

citizenship, worthy use of leisure, and ethical character. The contributions of the school subjects were to be judged on the basis of these aims; that is, on criteria largely outside the subjects. But not all subjects would be required to meet all aims to the same degree. While the report supported the comprehensive high school, as had that of the Ten, within it there was to be a differentiation of "curriculums" rather than one for all. The "constants" for all students were social studies and, apparently, English. As one of the "constants," the social studies were expected to be guided mainly by the seven principles. With some stretching of the imagination, the principles could be read into the 1916 report, but the latter was much closer to the subjects than could be inferred from the report of CRSE. The CRSE document, a moderate statement of social efficiency which fell far short of Sneddenism, nevertheless went considerably further toward social control than had the social studies report. CRSE represented a consensus of educators who were much more influenced by social efficiency than were those in the subject fields, certainly more so than were those in the social studies. The main line of social studies curricular development would be bonded to the 1916 report rather than to that of its parent body.

As often happens in curricular reform, the proposals that essentially responded to one period were effectuated in another. The 1916 report was published during the full tide of progressivism. Its implementation came later.

American entry into the war heightened interest in citizenship education, European history, modern history, and contemporary problems. The History Teachers Magazine supported the war effort, while warning that "historians must not distort or pervert the facts of history to suit the present struggle."[6] During the war the magazine changed its name to The Historical Outlook. The National Board for Historical Service, an agency created by historians, provided the magazine with syllabi linking the war with ancient, European, English, and American history. The proliferation of courses in current events reported in the magazine led to charges that these efforts were "a superficial rehash of current events."[7] To the "current events mind," one California high school history department chairman attributed attacks on Americans of German descent and other extremist statements or activities.[8]

Another development during the war was the institution of "war issues" courses on campuses, from which grew after the war introductory college courses which cut across disciplines, emphasizing synthesis and breadth. The most famous and influential was the "Contemporary Civilization" (CC) course at Columbia College, instituted in 1919, covering the history of Western civilization and representing the collaboration of four departments--economics, government, philosophy, and history. The chief influences on CC were none other than James Harvey Robinson and John Dewey, although they did not participate directly in its planning. Thus these two men profoundly affected the curriculum of both the schools and the colleges.

The Schafer Committee

Evidently the NEA was not entirely satisfied with the report of its 1916 committee, because in 1918 the organization requested the National Board for Historical Service, which had meanwhile become an organ of the AHA, to review the K-12 social studies curriculum and make recommendations. Perhaps the NEA sought better articulation among all the grades, the 1916 report having dealt only with the secondary school. In view of the CRSE report, it is interesting that the NEA turned to a historical agency that would inevitably pay more attention to the needs of the subjects than had CRSE. At the war's end, the AHA added several members to the group, which consisted of eight people--a mix of historians and teacher educators, most of whom had been active in the teachers' associations. Known as the Committee on History and Education for Citizenship, the group never acquired a popular title, being sometimes known by its full title, sometimes as the second Committee of Eight, sometimes as the Schafer committee after its chairman, Joseph Schafer, a University of California (Berkeley) historian who was a leader in the Pacific Coast branch of the AHA. This branch had fully integrated school teachers into its leadership, and it functioned somewhat in the manner of the regional teachers' associations.

The Schafer committee presented its report to the AHA in 1920, after due consultation with the still extant NEA Committee on the Social Studies.[9] The NEA group, whose membership overlapped somewhat with that of the AHA committee, had meanwhile developed an elementary school cur-

riculum closely resembling that of the AHA's own Committee of Eight (1909), whose curriculum was now well established in the grades. The Schafer report advocated a curriculum for the senior high school much like that envisioned by the 1916 NEA committee, except that it emphasized world history rather than European history and in general had a world focus. The high school curriculum for grades 7-12 was acceptable to the NEA. The Schafer committee also proposed a junior high curriculum (the Committee of Eight had reported before the junior high developed), again with a world focus. Here it ran into difficulty. For grade 9, the Schafer committee recommended "community and national activities," combining recent economic and social history with commercial geography and civics. Such a dilution of community civics was unacceptable to the NEA. But the real stickler was the elementary school curriculum (including grades 7 and 8), where the Schafer proposal departed too drastically from the Committee of Eight's pattern for the NEA's taste. The AHA's Schafer committee was thus in the uncomfortable position of advocating a curriculum that modified a previous AHA committee report, while this earlier AHA curriculum was embraced by the NEA.

The NEA Committee on the Social Studies had given assurances to the Schafer committee that it did not favor "teaching history backwards," that it agreed that the teaching of history involved "the inculcating of a particular method and a certain body of subject matter," that "interpretive ideas should form the core of the courses," and that history must be built on "definite, worthwhile ideas suggested by the subject matter." No doubt these assurances were addressed to historians' fears that the integrity of history was threatened; they certainly were at variance with the tenor of the CRSE report. The two groups were as one on a world focus and on the value of "socialized history." But the NEA was not about to give in on 9th-grade community civics or the elementary/junior high proposals.

These issues were vigorously debated at the AHA's annual meeting in 1920. At the AHA Council meeting, the council declined to endorse the report of its own curriculum committee. Just why the council failed to support the committee report is unclear, but its reluctance was probably due to dissension about the elementary and junior high proposals as well as hesitancy to throw overboard the Committee of Seven pattern. The

Schafer committee begged leave to be dismissed, requesting that it be permitted to publish course outlines, syllabi, and other materials based on the proposed curriculum. The council granted both requests, and the full report, including course materials, was duly published in a number of issues of The Historical Outlook.

In spite of its rejection by the AHA Council, the Schafer committee report had some influence. It showed how far historians were willing to go to accommodate new curricular thrusts and how far the NEA was willing to go to meet historical concerns. The AHA/NEA consensus on the high school curriculum was important; so was the emphasis on world history, which shortly began a modest growth in the schools. The differences over the junior high/elementary programs were not over history but over its placement and comprehensiveness. (The rapid growth of community civics was clearly a victory for the NEA's approach to grade 9.) The unofficial consensus helped to ensure a continuing interest by the historical profession in school history and in history in the schools at a time when specialization, as well as the sheer size of the institutions of formal education, could have driven them apart.

Growth of Specialization

During the 1920s and 1930s, specialization took many forms. One was specialization within the historical profession itself, a concomitant of the development of new knowledge in all fields. This was at least partially balanced, however, by the circumstance that, more than any of the other social sciences, history was a teaching field located professionally almost exclusively within educational institutions. In the 1920s and 1930s historians in colleges and universities concerned themselves with the creation of various types of general education courses--for example, "Western Civilization." This focus helped to counteract the effects of intensive specialization and thus kept historians closer to the similar needs of the schools, while the effort at synthesis suggested new and productive lines of research. Such general education courses often involved, as at Columbia, cooperation across disciplinary lines. The other social science associations, except for a brief flurry of activity between World War I and the mid-1920s, continued to keep their distance from the social studies.

A second aspect of specialization involved the formation of new professional bodies within education and the increased power and influence of old ones. The American Association of Teachers Colleges, founded in 1917, became a department of the NEA in 1925. Between 1921 and 1940, many normal schools were transformed into teachers' colleges, expanding their training to include secondary school teachers and becoming four-year institutions with degree-granting status. In the 1920s and 1930s the field of school administration, already firmly established, became more complex, differentiated, and inclusive, drawing even more heavily than hitherto on "scientific" management ideas and practices. Closely related was the emerging field of curriculum-making itself, proclaiming its allegiance to "scientific" method in the construction of curriculum, with a panoply of specific objectives, specified steps, and expected outcomes. With some notable exceptions, the leaders in these fields were ardent proponents of "social efficiency" and were hostile to the academic disciplines as such, especially history (American history being a partial exception) and most especially ancient history, with its deplorable association with Greek and Latin. A further aspect of specialization was the formation of national organizations in the school subjects, begun before World War I--of which the social studies was one, as we shall see. So linked to a school subject or field, the subject-matter associations helped to counteract the influence of those who wished to ignore or submerge them completely in the interests of social efficiency. At the same time they were affected by the views and activities of social-efficiency advocates.

Underlying all this was the enormous expansion of the schools, especially the high schools, which continued unabated through the next two decades, and the continued growth of colleges and universities. By 1940, some two-thirds of the youth from 14 to 16 years of age were in school, approaching the ideal of universality of which educators had long dreamed. The increasing number of students coming into the schools was widely believed to result in a lower--or at least different--quality of student, perpetuating the myth of an earlier "golden age" of the high school which has been rediscovered by every generation of educators in this century despite the dearth of supporting evidence. The very size of and internal differentiation in the educational system itself made

communication among its parts more cumbersome and difficult, and reformers often further removed from the classroom.

One aspect of specialization mentioned above was the activity of the professional social science associations following World War I. The first to enter the lists were the sociologists, with a committee chaired by Professor Ross L. Finney, who leaned strongly toward a severe version of social control. The Finney committee issued several reports, whose general import was to support the NEA/AHA consensus on the high school curriculum, but with a greater role for the "social sciences" (sociology and economics), particularly in grades 9 and 12, and more stress on social evolution. General social science--sociology, economics, civics, and ethics--was favored for grade 9. The sociologists, true to their past, regarded "social responsibility" as the "equivalent of a religious duty." Political science or government rather than history was considered to be the chief obstacle to curricular progress.[10]

The American Political Science Association charged its committee, which reported in 1921, with making recommendations for civics. The result was an attack on the amorphous nature of civics, a reassertion of the study of government structure and functions as the core of civics, and a 12th-grade course incorporating materials from sociology and economics with political science as its centerpiece. This sounded much like POD, with the proviso that "in the field of social studies all roads lead through government." The APSA did not adopt the report of its committee.[11]

The American Economic Association's committee, chaired by Leon C. Marshall, focused on the junior high school, recommending an integrated, sequential curriculum using what today would be called a "conceptual approach," with a heavy infusion of economic concepts. In addition, the committee recommended a number of courses in economics and business in the senior high.[12]

Thus, at the opening of the 1920s, the professional associations of sociologists, political scientists, and economists urged on the schools differing social studies curricula, each purporting to be "social science" and each attempting to take into account the claims of the others and in differing degrees those of history as well, while placing its own discipline at the center. None advocated a "pure" or theoret-

ical version of its discipline. All were united on citizenship education as the primary purpose of social studies education. How their varying and conflicting recommendations could be combined or reconciled was a formidable question. The disciplines constituting the social sciences held no common definition of themselves, except perhaps on a level of abstraction so general as to make translation into a unified curriculum exceedingly difficult. This was not surprising, in view of the fact that for decades they had been differentiating themselves from each other and from history. In political science, the trend of disciplinary reconstruction was from political philosophy to public administration and behaviorism; in economics from normative historical to neoclassical and mathematical; in sociology from "queen discipline" synthetics to empirical group studies. In each case, scientific status attached increasingly to the mastery of precise empirical methods of investigation, which often dictated the problems to be studied. If increasing specialization involved problems associated with the relationship of the historical profession to the schools, in the other social sciences it raised barriers much more difficult to breach. To further complicate matters, many citizens and other professional groups were busying themselves with attempting to influence the social studies curriculum. Among the most successful was the American Bar Association's campaign (supported by many civic bodies) for the required teaching of the Constitution.

The National Council for the Social Studies

That the 1916 NEA report with its 1921 addendum would eventually become the most widespread social studies pattern could not, of course, have been known to the educators of the early 1920s. At the time, it seemed that the newly named "social studies" were up for grabs. This curricular unrest was one of the factors that led to the formation of the National Council for the Social Studies in 1921, in an attempt to assert leadership--and impose order--by those directly concerned. Already there were precedents--subject organizations in geography, English, and mathematics, the latter two affiliated with the NEA, which had as yet no social studies section. Several abortive attempts at national organization in the social studies had been made directly after the war.

The idea was in the air. The formation of NCSS was due also to the presumed imminence of a comprehensive survey of the social studies whose auspices were not yet settled but which seemed certain to take place. Surveys were a popular way of "getting at the facts," and where facts were unknown or in dispute a social studies survey seemed eminently reasonable. Who would conduct the survey was obviously a matter of importance.

The effort that led directly to NCSS came from a group at Teachers College, Columbia University, most of whom were members of the continuing NEA Committee on the Social Studies. Heartened by the response to an exploratory letter outlining plans for an organization to coordinate work in the field which would be affiliated with the NEA and composed of elementary, secondary, normal school, and college teachers, teacher educators, and administrators, the group met on March 3, 1921, in Atlantic City during the annual meeting of the NEA Department of Superintendence. Albert McKinley, editor of The Historical Outlook, was persuaded to take the presidency, and Edgar Dawson, a political scientist and teacher educator from Hunter College in New York City, became secretary because, as he put it, no one else would take the job. The president and secretary were veteran officers of the Middle States association. Most of the founding group were from universities, either faculty members of schools of education or closely associated with education. They were fairly evenly distributed among the social sciences, and among them were Leon Marshall and Ross L. Finney, heads of the respective curriculum committees of the economists and sociologists. Both Marshall and Finney had strong tendencies toward social efficiency, although not so strong as those of the assistant secretary, Earl Rugg. Otherwise, the doctrine of social efficiency, except in its very mild version, had little support among the founders. Administrators, more inclined to a tough version of social efficiency and social control, were absent. An NCSS advisory board, soon appointed, added stature, regional balance, and broader representation, especially from the regional teachers' associations and the historians.

The new council quickly acquired a national periodical in The Historical Outlook, which, although owned not by the NCSS but by McKinley, hospitably opened its pages to NCSS and became a sort of unofficial

organ, continuing as such for a decade and a half, printing extensive accounts of the annual meetings and a yearly issue considered the NCSS yearbook.

From its auspicious, though modest, beginnings, NCSS faced two problems. One was the definition of the social studies, which tended to be defined by NCSS as a federation rather than a fusion of the social studies subjects. Another involved relationships with the learned societies. The NCSS wanted to avoid "college domination" while still involving the university scholars. An expanded advisory board was set up, consisting of representatives of the learned societies, several NEA departments, and regional associations of teachers of history and allied subjects expanded well beyond the original three.

The comprehensive survey envisioned by the early leaders of NCSS did not materialize. Instead, three separate reports eventuated. One was conducted by Leon Marshall, whose joint commission, independent of NCSS, succeeded in gathering statements from the learned societies on the distinct contributions of the various social science disciplines to the social studies and then faded away, leaving few discernible traces.[14] The second was the "History Inquiry," sponsored by the AHA and conducted by Edgar Dawson, the NCSS secretary. A truncated version of the hoped-for comprehensive survey, it revealed in some detail the shifts in curricular patterns. Dawson reported that about a third of the high schools were following the recommendations of the Committee of Seven, a third the 1916 NEA report, and a third were foundering "without chart or compass." Dawson called the situation "a confusion of tongues."[15] The "History Inquiry" also reported that superintendents strongly favored the teaching of recent or current problems over history instruction, being much less favorably inclined toward history than were principals, and that administrators in general showed considerable interest in some type of fused junior high course.

The NCSS survey, financed by the Commonwealth Fund, completed the trilogy. Conducted by J. Montgomery Gambrill of Teachers College, the survey described in some detail 15 cases of significant experimentation in junior and senior high school social studies, with a few references to elementary education.[16] Gambrill concluded his series with a summation of general tendencies:

--The dominant ideas were training for citizenship and meeting the needs of contemporary society, with the curriculum often based on "scientific" principles, overwhelmingly "useful," and almost never seeking advice from subject-matter specialists, an omission Gambrill deplored.

--The courses were almost universally composite, integrated, or fused, the more "conservative" around history, others ignoring disciplines altogether. Contemporary society, a "scientific" system, or "projects" stressing student freedom of choice were some of the bases for instruction--with varying results.

--Most courses sought the ideal of a complete survey of civic problems, often without much discrimination or attention to critical thinking.

--The idea and ideal that community life goes far beyond the usual civics was another theme, often involving school and classroom reorganization as a community, sometimes consisting of little more than local community boosterism.

--The actual practice of citizenship through student government, student assumption of certain school functions, student projects in the community, and other such activities characterized many of the experimental practices.

--In the teaching of history, Gambrill found many innovators who insisted that history must conform to the test of practical civic value, leading to the assumption that only modern history was worth studying and the more recent the better--a view Gambrill considered "utterly fallacious." A few wished to discard history altogether, and many considered current events more important than history. Current events, Gambrill reported, often consisted of a fast trip through five or ten topics superficially if not ignorantly treated. Nevertheless, he found much less disposition to dispense with the systematic study of history than he had expected. There was much attention to a crammed-full one-year course in world history (actually general European history), with no fresh interpretation or plan of organization.

--Schools were still "in bondage" to the textbook, with only modest improvements in the use of other instructional materials.

Gambrill also reported that he did not find any "clear" recognition that we live in a rapidly changing world and that "adjustment to environment must include adjustment to change." He found neither the "sneer" nor the superpatriotic method of dealing with social and political questions, merely commonplace and conventional treatment, sometimes sentimental and moralizing. There was little understanding of the equipment needed by teachers if they were to achieve even modest gains in the objectives so widely discussed.

Several other tendencies not named by Gambrill are evident from his reports: some efforts to state objectives in vaguely behavioral outcomes for each grade, a few attempts to organize curricula around developmental psychology or other learning theories, and a clear tendency for experimentation to be located in the junior high grades.

To an extraordinary degree, the tendencies which Gambrill found in experimental form would characterize the concerns of ensuing social studies reform, although their widespread implementation in the schools was another matter. Social efficiency, and sometimes social control, rode high. The loose-constructionist version of education for citizenship, as exemplified by the various AHA committees and the later NEA/AHA consensus, was seriously challenged in the 1920s by reformers themselves. In spite of the emphasis on "practicability," many of the innovative projects displayed in practice a commitment to a type of social education broader and more humane that their almost frantic concern with practical citizenship might suggest.

Some leaders of NCSS were involved in the experimental projects; others functioned as critics, friendly or otherwise. By 1928, the organization was well established, with more than 1,600 members, and growing in both influence and membership. The relationship of the NCSS to the proliferating local, regional, and state social studies teachers' associations is not entirely clear, but many became "branches" of NCSS. Nationally, the organization's ties were with the NEA (of which it had become a department in 1925) and the AHA, at whose annual December meeting the NCSS, after a few years of shifting around, conducted its own business meeting. During the late 1920s the NCSS abandoned its federated or representative board, originally designed to secure the cooperation of social scientists and other groups, when it proved too cumber-

some and when the close social science cooperation hoped for was not forthcoming.

The "History Inquiry" and the Gambrill report helped to stimulate further activity by the AHA. The inquiry revealed the fact that the social studies were clearly in transition. It could hardly have escaped the attention of historians that many of the innovations described by Gambrill included history as an important ingredient but that college and university (as distinct from normal or education school) historians were notable by their absence. Interest in the social studies curriculum on the part of the other social science associations carried the promise of further and more extensive involvement. If historians had once led the procession, now they seemed to be a scattered rear guard. Most fundamentally, the field in which historians had invested so much now seemed in search of a definition of itself, and what that definition might turn out to be was problematical.

References

1. [National Education Association], The Social Studies in Secondary Education, Bulletin 28 (1916), p. 9.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid., p. 34.

4. Ibid., p. 44.

5. [NEA] Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education, Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education, Bulletin 35 (1918).

6. History Teachers Magazine 8 (September 1917), p. 213.

7. Historical Outlook 10 (October 1919), p. 282 (hereafter cited as HO).

8. William H. Ellison, "The Current Events Mind," HO 9 (October 1918), pp. 381-83.

9. For the committee's report and the ensuing discussions, see HO 10 (May 1919), pp. 273-231; HO 11 (February 1920), pp. 73-83; HO 11 (March 1920), pp. 111-15; HO 12 (March 1921), pp. 87-97; HO 12 (April 1921), pp. 119-142; HO 12 (May 1921), pp. 165-184; HO 12 (June 1921), pp. 208-218.

10. "Tentative Report of the Committee on Teaching of Sociology in the Grade and High Schools of America," Papers and Proceedings, Fourteenth Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Society (Chicago: 1920), pp. 116-125.

11. "The Study of Civics," American Political Science Review 16 (1922), pp. 116-125.

12. "A Proposed Program of Social Studies in the Secondary Schools," American Economic Review 12 (March 1922), pp. 66-74.

13. Rollo M. Tryon, The Social Sciences as School Subjects (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935), pp. 58-64.

14. "Report of the Joint Commission on the Presentation of Social Studies in the Schools," Papers and Proceedings of the 26th Annual Meeting of the American Economic Association (1923), pp. 177-192.

15. Edgar Dawson, "The History Inquiry," HO 15 (June 1924), pp. 239-272.

16. The Gambrill survey appears in the December 1923 and the January and February 1924 issues of HO.

3. THE AHA COMMISSION ON THE SOCIAL STUDIES--THE 1930S

The Commission

By 1925, the historians were regrouping their forces. They had secured a fairly firm although sometimes troubled alliance with NCSS. They had formed a new committee on history teaching in the schools, with Professor A.C. Krey of the University of Minnesota as chairman. The composition of the committee suggested the AHA's resolve to take the idea of "the social studies" seriously and to include not only historians (mostly of the "new history" variety) but also eminent scholars from the other social sciences, teachers' colleges, and school administration. These included Charles E. Merriam, president of the American Political Science Association and founder of the Social Science Research Council; Jesse Newlon, president of the NEA and former superintendent of schools in Denver; Henry Johnson of Teachers College, Columbia, and author of one of the most influential methods textbooks; Leon C. Marshall, chairman of the American Economic Association's committee on the schools; and Ernest Horn, a professor of education at the University of Iowa.

Reporting to the AHA in 1927, the committee outlined a plan for a comprehensive study of the state of social studies education and for making suggestions for improvement, including objectives, content and its organization, grade placement, instructional methods, testing, teacher preparation, and contributions from foreign practice. The report was adopted and the committee was further enlarged to include more members from history, the other social sciences, administration, and schools of education (the latter members were from Columbia's Teachers College). The committee included four leaders of NCSS (John-

son, Marshall, Horn, and Krey). A number of the historian members were also active in the regional history teachers' associations, that of the Middle States again being the most influential.

In one sense, the new committee on the social studies was a rough reverse image of the 1916 NEA Committee on the Social Studies. Where the NEA committee had been heavily weighted with members from secondary education with only a scattering from the universities, the new committee was heavily weighted with university scholars with no secondary school members other than administrators. The university members included representatives from all the social sciences except anthropology. However, both committees included solid contingents from the teachers' associations, and the chief intellectual influences in each are equally significant, for they were both "new historians": James Harvey Robinson on the NEA committee and his close colleague Charles A. Beard on the new committee. In fact, so thoroughly did Beard dominate the latter's work that the group was often referred to as the "Beard commission," as well as the "Krey commission." The influence of Dewey is evident in the work of both committees.

Relationships between the new group and the NEA were more tenuous than had been the case in any previous national curricular committee on the social studies. The Ten and the 1916 committee were official NEA bodies, and even the Committee of Seven had been organized at the NEA's request. The AHA commission included a recent president of the NEA and both a recent and a current president of two NEA affiliates, the powerful American Association of School Administrators and NCSS. The distance between the NEA and the AHA and other professional social science associations had widened immeasurably since the days of the Ten and the Seven, and the inclusion of NEA leaders was an attempt to bridge it.

The committee obtained a grant from Carnegie for a five-year study, transformed itself into the Commission on the Social Studies, and set up offices and a paid staff, headed by a leader of NCSS, W.G. Kimmel. Its work was launched in January of 1929, less than a year before the stock market crash and the onset of the depression. It was to be the most elaborate and comprehensive commission in the history of the social studies, although, as it turned out, not the most influential. During the course of its work, which involved scores of consultants and writers

in its various subcommittees and other activities, the commission attracted an impressive array of persons of divergent views, extreme advocates of hard-line social efficiency being in a tiny minority. It was the Robinson/Beard/Dewey version of social efficiency that the commission expressed, suitably adapted to a nation caught in a depression.

The commission's work appeared in a series of volumes by different authors as well as in two reports of the commission as a whole. The first expression of the whole commission was a volume devoted to objectives, which appeared as the country was plunging into the depression. This volume, A Charter for the Social Sciences (1932), edited by Charles A. Beard, set forth the "conditioning realities" of the social studies: the spirit and letter of scholarship, the realities and ideas of society, and the nature and limitations of the teaching and learning process.[1] It stood for the tentative nature of knowledge and for inquiry, rather than indoctrination, as the appropriate education for citizens. The supreme purpose of the social studies was to help to produce the "rich and many-sided personalities" which a democratic society needed and deserved through an education that allowed the fullest possible development of every individual. It outlined the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values to be acquired.

The report sought to counter some of the contemporary tendencies in the social studies. It rejected the idea of a general social science and of a curriculum detached from the traditional social science disciplines. A curriculum based on problems of democracy was held to be insufficient. The report pointed out forcefully that the school was not the only source of knowledge, that both children and adults learned elsewhere and that the school had to recognize this fact. The static perfectionisms of indoctrination for both the status quo and utopianism were rejected in favor of a progressive, dynamic view suitable for a progressive, dynamic society. On all these matters, the Charter was remarkably clear.

But for all its emphasis on "conditioning realities" and its flashing insights, the report was confused or negligent on some of the difficult questions. The Charter did little to clarify the relationships among the social sciences, and it even failed to make up its collective mind on what was to be included under the rubric. History was to be the

"crown" of the social subjects, the synthesizing, integrating force--but just what this meant, for both history and the other social subjects, was left unclarified. Social science was "neutral" insofar as it was scientific, but for the schools it must be "ethical." This contradiction was unexplored, its "solution" presumably being the creation of rich, many-sided personalities. Social studies appeared to be the same as civic instruction, but this point was not clear. The contributions social science could make to such purposes were often strained, and the classroom applications suggested were awkward and amateurish. The sections on the teaching/learning process were weak and brief: all that was said had been said before in more sophisticated fashion and with a firmer grasp of classroom realities. In this, as in many other sections of the report, few coherent connections between the schools and the social studies were made.

The report held up advocacy with one hand and put it down with the other. Indoctrination was explicitly and vigorously rejected, but instruction was to be shaped by a ten-point platform that was essentially a program for what came to be called a welfare state. And, in fact, substantial portions of it were enacted under the New Deal. This contradiction was barely recognized in the Charter.

The publication of the Charter was followed by a number of volumes by individual authors as well as the final Conclusions and Recommendations, most of which were of very high quality. Of these, only a few will be mentioned. Beard, in addition to editing the Charter, wrote The Nature of the Social Sciences (1934).[2] This was a brilliant and closely argued work, a penetrating analysis of the social sciences collectively and severally and of their relationships to the natural sciences, dealing incisively with empiricism, the scientific method, ethics, and esthetics, setting forth Beard's view that the social sciences were both empirical and ethical, but fundamentally the latter. Beard also included an outline of knowledge and content for the several social studies subjects, stressing their "vital interrelationships." He continued to view the creation of "rich and many-sided personalities" as the great purpose of the social studies. He had little difficulty relating his argument to knowledge, skill, and attitude objectives so long as they were those commonly dealt with in the social sciences. But with "objec-

tives as qualities and powers of personality" he was profoundly uncomfortable. This was the weakest section of his work.

Beard cleared up some of the mysteries of the Charter, but he did not come to grips with the conditioning realities of the school or the classroom. Indeed, it was already obvious that the classroom was too peripheral to Beard's frame of reference (to use a favorite Beardian and commission term) to allow him to do so. Nevertheless, generations of social studies reformers right up to the mid-1960s were deeply influenced by the Charter and Nature. Both volumes were frequently used in formulating objectives in texts, curriculum guides, yearbooks, and other professional social studies literature.

Closely related to Beard's work was that of George S. Counts, the commission's director of research and a leading "social reconstructionist," whose little book, Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order? (1932), had challenged the schools to reconstruct society by reconstructing themselves.[3] The social reconstructionists, centered at Teachers College, believed that laissez-faire individualism was dead, that some sort of collectivist planning and control was inevitable, and that in its creation the schools should play a critical role. Neither Marxists nor, with a few exceptions, social activists, they saw themselves as building on a great American democratic idea and a tradition of struggle to realize it. Counts's commission volume, Social Foundations of Education (1934), was an eloquent statement of a reconstructionist view, setting education within a broad historical and contemporary analysis of American culture.[4] Counts believed that social studies instruction should "be organized within a frame of reference provided by the ideal of a democratic collectivism." He seemed to advocate a fairly explicit form of social control which amounted to indoctrination, even though he also explicitly rejected the latter. His critics charged that indoctrination was inevitable, given his delineation of the purpose and direction of the school. A milder reconstructionist view applied to administration was set forth in Jesse Newlon's Educational Administration as Social Policy (1934)[5], while Merle Curti's The Social Ideas of American Educators (1935)[6] was a pioneering contribution to the history of education told through biographies which became a classic in its field. Counts's work suggested the general method of Curti's research, but

Curti was more mindful of problems presented by the frame of reference of the writer, and he avoided offering Counts's prescriptions to the schools.

Most of the volumes published were not the work of the social reconstructionists, although they were written within the general rubric of the Charter. Such were Charles E. Merriam's Civic Education in the United States (1934)[7] and Isaiah Bowman's Geography in Relation to the Social Sciences (1934).[8] Both authors were major figures in their respective disciplines. Henry Johnson's An Introduction to the History of the Social Sciences in the Schools (1932) is a short, lucid survey of European and American education since the 16th century which revealed Johnson's skepticism about recent attempts at disciplinary integration and the uses of history to explain the present.[9] The Social Sciences as School Subjects (1935), by Rollo M. Tryon, a careful, methodical volume full of useful information on the history of the social sciences in the schools, is an invaluable reference work.[10] Ernest Horn's Methods of Instruction in the Social Studies (1937) drew extensively on Dewey in a thoughtful, practical book for the classroom teacher.[11] Curriculum-Making in the Social Studies: A Social Process Approach (1936), by Leon C. Marshall and Rachel Marshall Goetz, suggested a curriculum built around basic social processes, although not the curriculum itself. It placed a strong emphasis on social engineering.[12] "New-type" (objective) testing and its problems were discussed in Truman Kelley and A.C. Krey's Tests and Measurement in the Social Sciences (1934),[13], while Bessie L. Pierce, in Citizens' Organizations and the Civic Training of Youth (1933), surveyed the educational and civic policies of a large number of civic groups and their efforts to educate youth outside of school and to affect civic instruction within the schools. She made it abundantly clear that formal civic training on a large scale took place outside of school and that there was no consensus among the various groups on what school citizenship instruction should be.[14] William C. Bagley and Thomas Alexander, in The Teacher of the Social Studies (1937), described teacher characteristics and teacher preparation rather briefly and included a survey of social studies teachers in Germany, England, and France.[15] In Are American Teachers Free? (1936), Howard K. Beale analyzed restraints on the freedom of teaching.[16] These books,

which constituted the bulk of the commission's work, were published as numbered volumes of the report. Taken collectively, they represented a major contribution to social studies education. But their impact was more individual than collective; they were issued over a number of years, some of them after the commission itself was ended--a circumstance that perhaps gave rise to the later impression that the commission lasted throughout the decade of the depression.

In addition to the Charter, another volume that represented the views of the commission as a whole was entitled Conclusions and Recommendations (1934). Although it had deep roots in the past, Conclusions was the expression of a particular time and place. The book was a very American document in its confidence in the promise of democracy, its belief in progress and social change, and its commitment to education. It was hammered out in the early years of the New Deal when various forms of national planning such as the National Recovery Act were being tested and new governmental policies were being enacted which were more sweeping than could have been envisioned a few short years before. The Conclusions expressed a particular form and kind of democratic American radicalism which such a commission could have offered to the schools only in that shimmering moment as a basis for their philosophy, organization, and curriculum.

The Conclusions set forth the commission's threefold frame of reference: "the nature and functions of the social sciences," necessarily conditioning factors in American life, and "choices deemed possible and desirable in the present and proximate future."[17] According to the commission, the social sciences took as their province the entire range of human history and the widest reaches of contemporary society throughout the world. All were related, but each had an intrinsic core and a distinctive viewpoint. The scientific method was essential but had severe limitations; it could not supply individuals or society with "will, force, or purpose." Nor did the social sciences contain an inner logic that determined the scope, content, or structures of social science materials to be used in instruction, which transmitted "social science knowledge and thought with attendant skills and loyalties."

Next the commission turned to "conditioning factors in American life," while emphasizing that the United States was part of a "world

civilization." Well-established traditions based on the ideals of popular democracy and personal liberty and dignity would certainly give direction to the American future. The country was in a period of transition. In the United States and other countries, "the age of laissez-faire and individualism" was "closing" and the strongest trend was toward "the integration and interdependence of all branches of the economy, social activity, and culture," which was characterized by the commission, courageously or foolishly (and certainly loosely), as "a new age of collectivism." This transition involved severe tensions, the commission stated. The historic principles and ideals of American democracy could and should be retained as a means of adjustment to the emerging integrated society, and the rights and freedom of the individual should be protected, although "acquisitive individualism" should be "subdued."

The commission then examined the implications of these views for education. Philosophy and purpose in education (education was defined as "action," a Countsian conception) involved moral conceptions that required choices, the commission declared, proceeding to state its own. A "full and frank recognition that the old order is passing, and that the new order is emerging" was required. Such knowledge of realities and the capacity to cooperate were indispensable to American society. Conversely, continuing to emphasize "the traditional ideals and values of economic individualism" would intensify the conflicts and perils of transition. In addition to developing rich and many-sided personalities, which the commission's Charter had identified as the primary purpose of instruction, education should prepare the rising generation to enter the emerging order through knowledge and ideal rather than coercion and ignorance and to shape it according to American democratic ideals. This represented a subtle but nevertheless decided shift toward a social reconstructionist view.

These sections of the Conclusions are so full of qualifications that a fair summary is difficult to make. Like the Charter, the summary volume often took back with one hand what it offered with the other. The tone is oracular and magisterial. On this portentous framework, the commission hung a rather conventional series of recommendations, given its conceptions of purposes.

The curriculum, or the "social science program" as the commission called it, should include the usual disciplines, covering Earth as the home of men; the evolution of civilization, Western civilization, and American civilization; a realistic story of the major peoples and cultures of the contemporary world with more attention to Latin America, Africa, and especially Asia and of international efforts to promote peace; contemporary American life (including its contradictions and tensions); the great theories and philosophies (however radical or conservative) designed to deal with the problems of industrial society; and the use of sources of information and methods of inquiry (substantially the "scientific method").

The program, the commission believed, is fundamentally conditioned by the evolving experience and powers of the child--from near to remote in time and space, from sensory response to abstraction, from helplessness to group participation (including participation in movements of social reform and reconstruction). Social studies should be related to "the life interests of the pupil: almost anything could be studied if brought into relationship with the learner's experience at almost any level of maturity"--a principle that surfaced some decades later in the work of Jerome Bruner. More specifically, but still at a high level of generality, the commission recommended "the making of the community and the nation" as the elementary school theme and "the development of mankind and the evolution of human culture" for the secondary, culminating in a study of regional geography, comparative economics, government, cultural sociology, the major movements of thought and action in the modern world, and recent international developments.

This was the sum of the commission's "program" for the schools. Just how it would be translated into an actual scope and sequence the commission left to others.

Other recommendations were made on teacher training and methods (the commission denounced method divorced from knowledge, thought, and purpose but gave few specifics) and on testing, conditions of teaching, and administration, the latter dealing with "a redistribution of power in the conduct of education."

Appended to the report was a series of "next steps," among them the explanation that the commission had not been instructed to provide a

detailed syllabus and textbooks to be "imposed." The report pointed out that many methods of organizing materials and teaching were possible and desirable within its frame of reference and urged educators to proceed with implementation.

The Conclusions and Recommendations, drafted by Beard and Counts, had been a matter of acrimonious debate within the commission. Charles Merriam, among others, had long been wary of George Counts, whom he considered too "radical," and of Counts's influence on Beard.[18] It must be remembered, however, that "radical" is a relative term and that all the commission members seemed to have favored some sort of national planning and an end to laissez-faire. At what turned out to be its final meeting at Princeton in December 1933, the commission members could not reach agreement on their report. Disagreement apparently centered on Chapter 2, in which the commission's frame of reference was set forth. Merriam failed in his attempt to exempt the offending chapter from a commission vote to approve the entire document in principle. While Beard and Merriam were out of the room, the commission voted to ask chairman Krey to request the two men to clarify their views and report the results of their deliberation to the commission. This proved to be impossible, however, because Beard had already left Princeton.[19] Ernest Horn later recalled that the members had not been able to resolve the issue of the distinction between "basic social problems and the implementation of theory at the public high school level," although he believed they were on the verge of a breakthrough.[20] Shortly after the Princeton meeting, the commission's affairs were somewhat abruptly concluded by the AHA secretary.

Probably the problem Horn described encompassed two major concerns of the dissenters. The first was their opposition to the use of the term "collectivism" and the second was their belief that in fact the document called for indoctrination. Four members refused to sign the Conclusions: Frank Ballou, Washington, D.C., superintendent of schools; Edmund E. Day, director of social sciences for the Rockefeller Foundation; Merriam, and Horn. Isaiah Bowman signed with highly specific reservations which made clear his impatience at what he considered overstatement, imprecision, and tendentiousness. The others, offered the opportunity to state their objections in writing, declined to do so.

The divisions within the committee were not between social scientists and educators but rather between people more directly involved in the world of public affairs and those largely within academia.

The educational reception of the final Conclusions and Recommendations reflected the dissent within the commission. The report was widely praised, but praise was almost always larded with criticism. Most of the critics seemed to be in general agreement with the frame of reference as a statement about society, although there were numerous caveats about collectivism. Their chief objections were that the commission had failed to provide a social studies scope and sequence, as previous national committees had done; that the recommendations imposed a crushing burden on the classroom teacher; and that the report ignored the real world of the schools. The educational philosopher Boyd H. Bode, while praising the social philosophy of the Conclusions, wrote:

> The basic defect of the Report lies in the fact that it attempts to combine an authoritarian "frame of reference" with its cultivation of effective and independent thinking. The result of this misguided attempt is that the recommendations which are made are comparatively innocuous. The recommendations are not pressed because this would endanger the ideal of independent thinking. On the other hand, they do not set the stage for genuinely independent thinking because this would challenge the finality of "the frame of reference." The moral is that we cannot eat our cake and have it.[21]

The official commission statements, as well as the volumes by individuals, were widely discussed in the social studies literature of the 1930s, including NCSS yearbooks and local curriculum guides. The commission's influence was marked but diffuse: the impact of the whole was less than that of its parts. It lacked the kind of central focus that earlier curriculum committees had achieved with their explicit recommendations on scope and sequence. No one took up the commission's challenge to remake the social studies curriculum, or at least not in a national form like that of earlier committees.

From The Historical Outlook to Social Education

One "next step" announced by the commission, however, involved a step of its own: arrangement for the AHA in cooperation with NCSS to take over The Historical Outlook, using the surplus still left from the

Carnegie grant and anticipated royalties from publications. In 1934 the publication was duly renamed The Social Studies. AHA's rather complicated arrangement with the McKinley Publishing Company proved unsatisfactory to both the AHA and NCSS, and after the death of Professor McKinley, The Social Studies went its own way. With the AHA's continued subsidy and sponsorship, a new publication known as Social Education was founded in 1936 with Erling Hunt of Teachers College as editor. An effort to interest the economists, sociologists, and political scientists in supporting the journal had come to nought, although the APSA and ASS authorized the use of their names, together with the AHA, on the masthead.[22] With the launching of Social Education the NCSS at last had its own publication, identified with the organization from the beginning.

The Decline and Recovery of NCSS

In 1934 NCSS was in serious difficulties. Whether it would have survived without the AHA's help cannot be known. The depression had a catastrophic effect on the finances of voluntary organizations and on the schools, which struggled with more students and less money. NCSS membership, which had reached a respectable 2,000 by 1929, dropped to 700 in 1934 and the council's bank account was almost wiped out. After 1934, things began to pick up. By 1941, NCSS had almost 3,000 members. In 1940, the AHA transferred full ownership of Social Education to NCSS while agreeing to continue its subsidy as long as the defunct commission's funds held out. The AHA continued its sponsorship, which included representation on the editorial board. In the same year, the NCSS acquired its first paid executive secretary in the person of Wilbur M. Murra and moved its hitherto nomadic offices to the NEA building in Washington.

There can be no question that the AHA subsidy and the acquisition of a journal of its own were major factors in the recovery of NCSS. It is difficult to see how the council could have continued without a journal and even more difficult to imagine how it could have gotten one on its own. Whether considered an act of enlightened self-interest, educational statesmanship or both, the AHA's generous arrangement helped the NCSS to become a more independent, stable, and self-assured organiza-

tion and again underlined the historians' continuing commitment to social studies education, in contrast to the fitful and distant albeit friendly stance of the professional associations of the other social scientists.

A second factor in the recovery of NCSS was the publication, beginning in 1931, of a series of yearbooks issued separately from The Historical Outlook, which had previously included NCSS "yearbooks" in its pages. This act of gallantry, presided over by Bessie L. Pierce at a bleak time in the organization's fortunes, initiated a yearbook series of high quality that helped the council to reach a wider audience. In 1936, after a hiatus of six years, NCSS resumed its bulletin series, publishing 12 before the United States entered World War II.

In the "Foreword" to the 1934 yearbook, The Social-Studies Curriculum, Howard E. Wilson of Harvard identified several distinct trends in social studies education.[23] One was the tendency for subject-matter boundaries to become less distinct as the curriculum incorporated a much wider range of materials from the social sciences and as history became more incisive and flexible. Closely related were the tendencies to group material in "units" of related materials and to break down disciplinary boundaries, not only between the social studies subjects but between them and other subjects--a process variously labeled as correlation, integration, fusion, and articulation. Two significant controversies reported were the problem of indoctrination and the extent to which the interests of pupils (whether discovered or created by the teacher) should guide curriculum making. None of these trends and controversies were new--the astute reader will recognize that many of them were touched on by the venerable Committee of Ten--but in the mid-1930s they arose with particular insistence. Underlying and related to all of these matters was an assumption that the education of citizens for a democratic society was the fundamental business of the social studies. The question was not whether this was the basic social studies purpose, but whether it could best be accomplished by some variety of curricular fusion or through the separate disciplines suitably broadened, by indoctrination or critical thinking, or by basing the curriculum on student interest or on societal needs. Many of these questions were treated in subsequent NCSS yearbooks and in Social Education.

Active Citizenship Education: The Educational Policies Commission

Specific attention to an active, participatory type of citizenship education was evident during the 1930s. This was hardly a new theme: community civics, with its functional rather than formal approach and its increasing inclusiveness, had been growing since the first decade of the century. The rise of various forms of totalitarianism abroad and attacks on the curriculum and freedom of teaching at home spurred educators to advocate an education that would give students an opportunity to practice democracy in the classroom, school, and community. This was exemplified in the Educational Policies Commission, a collaborative effort of the NEA and the American Association of School Administrators. This body, formed in 1935, included two erstwhile warring members of the AHA commission, George Counts and Edmund Day. The EPC's report, published in 1940, surveyed some 90 schools and described six different types of education for democracy which were practiced in schools. The report concluded that all six types had promise but had not fulfilled the commission's objective: citizenship education that was active, participatory, and reflective and which involved the total life of the school. The commission outlined 12 "hallmarks" of a democratic education.[24]

The position of the EPC and of other advocates of a democratic education constituted an answer to the problems of both indoctrination and a "life interests" curriculum. The schools were to commit themselves to the systematic development of an education exemplifying the desirability and necessity of democracy as a way of life. To this extent it could be argued that indoctrination for democracy was favored, although the proponents did not so argue. Rather, they asserted that, given this necessary commitment and as an essential aspect of it, students should be challenged and encouraged to think critically and reflectively, to examine controversial issues, to acquire the broad knowledge needed for citizens in a democracy, in classroom, school, and community. The type of life-interests approach that focused on immediately perceived or stated pupil interests, and thus encouraged a shallow or self-centered individualism at the expense of a broader societal conception, was found seriously wanting.

The 1940 EPC report dealt with the school as a whole in the spirit of "democratic efficiency," an updated version of the soft or Deweyan social efficiency idea. The commission did not attempt to outline a sequential curriculum for the social studies or for any other subject, although its members expressed serious concerns about the incoherent addition of numerous topics as separate courses rather than as integrated parts of the curriculum. Nor did they assign civic education to the social studies alone, although they cited many examples of exemplary social studies units or courses.

Curricular Fusion

The thrust of the EPC report clearly supported some type of curricular fusion. In the 1930s, fusion and its variants had advanced beyond the social studies to encompass combinations across subject fields, such as social studies and English, as well as combinations of non-social-studies subjects. By the end of the decade these experiments were being labeled "the core curriculum." The publications of the Eight-Year Study of the Progressive Education Association in 1941 showed how far active citizenship education, social studies fusion, and the core curriculum had developed in some 30 outstanding "progressive" schools, both public and private.

All this curricular ferment did not, however, result in the emergence of a new, national, updated version of the social studies curriculum. Instead, the NEA/AHA consensus became the common high school pattern. The Bureau of Education survey of course offerings for 1933-1934 showed that in the high school American history was holding its own, while registration in "foreign history" (such as ancient, English, medieval, and modern European), formerly given over two years, had declined, being partially supplanted by a one-year course in "world history," involving half the time but about the same proportion of students. Enrollment in community civics or government was twice as high as enrollment in civil government, and the "Problems of Democracy" courses gained rapidly at the expense of sociology, economics, and, of course, civil government.[25] History, although diminished, and civics, although changed, remained as the spine of the social studies structure.

At the end of the decade, NCSS responded to the challenge of the AHA Commission on the Social Studies by publishing The Future of the Social Studies (1939), which the editor, James A. Michener, characterized as "merely the first step in what may become a sustained effort to bring some order into a confused field . . . a picture of what several scholars envision the future to be."[26] The 15 contributors, who included A.C. Krey, dealt with both the elementary and secondary school curricula. Each presented a coherent curricular plan with varying levels of specificity. As Michener pointed out, "for the questions of what to teach and when to teach it there are no clear answers." Michener also mentioned the growth of "core," which he said was absorbing the social studies in many schools, a development he regarded as not necessarily regrettable but one that should not occur by default.

In spite of many variations, however, those authors who chose to go into a bit of detail were in general agreement on the last three years of high school as broadly corresponding to the AHA/NEA consensus. There was much less agreement on grades 7-9, although American history was favored in grade 8. Boiled down to the major emphases in each grade, the results were as follows: grade 7 tended to be divided between the Old World and the New; grade 8 was some version of American history; grade 9 revealed no general pattern, some favoring the community, several Pan-America, several some type of world geography or world social relations--with one holdout for ancient and medieval history; grade 10 tended to be European or world history; grade 11 American history; grade 12 some variety of POD. The "history" proposed was broadened, eclectic, and fused, often presented under the rubric of "culture" or "civilization," with a strong emphasis on social and economic aspects and on "problems." The civic education purposes of the social studies permeated the volume, but the community civics course so beloved of the NEA 1916 committee tended to be diffused into other courses. There was little sentiment for separate courses in economics, sociology, or government.

The Progressive Education Association

This valiant effort of the NCSS involved a serious effort--or series of efforts--to come to grips directly with the curriculum itself. In contrast, The Social Studies in General Education, a 1940 report of the Progressive Education Association's Committee on the Function of the Social Studies in General Education (a subgroup of the PEA's Commission on Secondary School Curriculum), bypassed the curriculum as scope and sequence almost entirely: this was an approach with which, in any case, the PEA had little sympathy. Instead, the report focused on the needs of adolescents--personal/social, social/civic, and economic--with separate chapters on "personal living" and "community living." Strongly influenced by sociology, psychology, and social psychology and to some extent by anthropology, although not proposing these as subjects, the PEA committee's approach exemplified a favorite preoccupation of the 1930s--the adolescent. The criteria the committee advocated for the selection of materials were "those which can be used directly to meet the needs of the particular adolescents."[27] The report thus envisioned a social studies education in which the perennial question "What knowledge is of most worth?" was answered by an appeal to adolescent needs. It was straight social efficiency, now relabeled "democratic efficiency" or "social competence," not the Snedden version but certainly not the Deweyan version either.

The report's brief historical review of the various earlier social studies commissions and committees advanced an interpretation of the social studies past already embraced by many reformers and one which would become increasingly popular. The Committees of Ten and Seven were charged with advocating "a more or less severely didactic presentation of historical facts" whose "dominant methods were consequently to be textbook memorization, class recitation, and fact tests. Such methods of instruction were supposed to discipline the mind, provide economy in learning, and establish a proper respect for authority."[28] The most charitable comment that can be made about such an assessment is that it could not have been based on a reading of the documents. This interpretation represented an historical double-bind. First, the report assumed that textbook memorization and other attendant ills had indeed characterized social studies instruction. No evidence was offered to support

this view, which was simply asserted as accurate. Secondly, by misstating what these earlier committees had actually advocated, the report did not have to deal with the question of why their recommendations as to method had not been effectuated in the schools, assuming that the PEA assessment of the actual school situation was accurate. Nor did the report attempt to analyze the reasons for the influence of the Committees of Ten and Seven, which were pictured as responding to the simpler needs of a preindustrial age.

In contrast, "many of the proposals" of the 1916 NEA report "were almost revolutionary for their time," an estimate that would have surprised those living in the period. Alas, the 1916 recommendations, in spite of their acknowledged impact, did not "solve the problem of education for effective social living."[29] This state of affairs was attributed to the solid entrenchment of traditional practices and the fact, evident to the PEA committee, that national committees could not successfully offer solutions to "the problem of effective social education." The AHA Commission on the Social Studies was found to have "contributed significantly to thought concerning social-studies instruction," but to have disappointed many teachers by offering "no specific pattern of social-studies instruction for universal application--no single and easy answer to the manifold problems."[30] This attitude on the part of so many teachers might have been interpreted as a real "felt need" to be taken seriously. It might even have been seen as a willingness to depart from "traditional patterns." Instead, the PEA committee chose to view it as a bit of nostalgia, a search for a panacea, a failure by teachers to face current realities and problems and to take responsibility for solving them.

Two of the eleven members of the PEA committee were leaders in NCSS--I. James Quillen, cochairman, and Howard E. Wilson, then NCSS secretary, both of whom had contributed to the NCSS volume on the curriculum. In the latter, Quillen had suggested a curriculum based on contemporary "social living" with a few bows to the past, mostly in the elementary grades. Quillen's NCSS contribution was reasonably consistent with that of the PEA report. Howard Wilson's contribution to the NCSS volume was much more strongly historical than Quillen's, and for the high school stayed fairly close to the NEA/AHA consensus for "high-

ability pupils." For "general" students, the historical treatment was less systematic and for "low-ability pupils" the consensus disappeared into a three-year sequence about problems and institutions in contemporary American life. History treated chronologically was to be the property of the ablest. The least able were judged to need neither history nor an understanding of the world beyond American shores.

Despite some overlap in personnel, the NCSS and PEA volumes represented two differing approaches to the social studies curriculum at the end of the 1930s, both speaking in the name of education for democracy. The first, while not seeking to advocate a singular national curriculum, incorporated the education of citizens for a democratic society into concrete curricular scope-and-sequence recommendations. The second bypassed such an approach, instead using the personal/social needs of adolescents as the curricular touchstone. The "fusion" approach so evident in the reform literature of the 1920s and 1930s had made its greatest inroads in the junior high school, sometimes in the emergence of a "core" curriculum but more frequently in the expansion of history to cover a broader range of topics. Both the NCSS and the PEA volumes were, of course, reform documents, and neither represented widespread or typical school practice, so far as such can be ascertained. They were hopes for the future rather than descriptions of the present.

References

1. Charles A. Beard ("drafted by"), A Charter for the Social Sciences in the Schools (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932).

2. Charles A. Beard, The Nature of the Social Sciences in Relation to Objectives of Instruction (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934).

3. George S. Counts, Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order? (New York: John Day, 1932).

4. George S. Counts, Social Foundations of Education (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934).

5. Jesse Newlon, Educational Administration as Social Policy (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934).

6. Merle Curti, The Social Ideas of American Educators (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935).

7. Charles E. Merriam, Civic Education in the United States (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934).

8. Isaiah Bowman, Geography in Relation to the Social Sciences (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934).

9. Henry Johnson, An Introduction to the History of the Social Sciences in the Schools (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932). Johnson's manuscript had "history" rather than "the social sciences" in the title. He rightly commented later that the original title "more correctly" described the book.

10. Rollo M. Tryon, The Social Sciences as School Subjects (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935).

11. Ernest Horn, Methods of Instruction in the Social Studies (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1937).

12. Leon C. Marshall and Rachel Marshall Goetz, Curriculum-Making in the Social Studies: A Social Process Approach (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1946). Ms. Goetz was Marshall's daughter.

13. Truman Kelly and A.C. Krey, Tests and Measurements in the Social Sciences (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934).

14. Bessie L. Pierce, Citizens' Organizations and the Civic Training of Youth (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1933).

15. William C. Bagley and Thomas Alexander, The Teacher of the Social Studies (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1937).

16. Howard K. Beale, Are American Teachers Free? An Analysis of Restraints Upon the Freedom of Teaching in American Schools (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936).

17. Conclusions and Recommendations of the Commission (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934), p. 5.

18. For an account of the relationship between Merriam and Beard and their impact on the commission, see Barry D. Karl, Charles E. Merriam and the Study of Politics (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974), pp. 186-200.

19. "Minutes of the Meeting of the Commission on Investigation of Social Studies," Princeton, December 21 and 22, 1933. American Historical Association Papers, Commission for Investigation of Social Studies in the Schools, Part B, Container 781.

20. Peter Soderbergh, "Charles A. Beard and the Commission on the Social Studies," Social Studies 31 (October 1967), p. 467.

21. B.H. Bode, "Which Way Democracy?," Social Studies 25 (November 1934), pp. 343-46. For a series of reactions to the Conclusions, see Social Studies 25 (October 1934).

22. For a detailed discussion, see Louis M. Vaneria, "The National Council for the Social Studies: A Voluntary Organization for Professional Service" (Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1958), pp. 160-170.

23. Fourth Yearbook: The Social-Studies Curriculum (Philadelphia: McKinley Publishing Co., 1934), pp. 5-7.

24. Educational Policies Committee, Learning the Ways of Democracy: A Casebook of Civic Education (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1940).

25. Offerings and Registrations in High-School Subjects, Office of Education Bulletin 1938, no. 6 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Interior, Office of Education, 1938), pp. 5-6, 52-61.

26. James A. Michener, ed., The Future of the Social Studies: Proposals for an Experimental Social-Studies Curriculum (Cambridge, Mass.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1939), p. 4.

27. The Social Studies in General Education: A Report of the Committee on the Function of the Social Studies in General Education for the Commission on Secondary School Curriculum (New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1940), p. 385.

28. Ibid., p. 44.

29. Ibid., p. 5.

30. Ibid., p. 7.

4. WORLD WAR II--THE 1940S AND 1950S

Historians and the Role of History in the Social Studies

For most of the learned societies, whose involvement with the schools was friendly but distant, the various curricular proposals of the late 1930s were of only casual interest. The case of the historians was different. The long association of both the AHA and the Mississippi Valley Historical Association with the schools and the curriculum gave them a special stake in the social studies. The support given to NCSS and Social Education by the AHA represented a continuation of this relationship. But the quality of the relationship was slowly changing as professional historians moved from being insiders to a more peripheral position in the social studies movement. No longer were major historians in such close touch either with the schools or with social studies reform. Increasingly they relied on the reform literature and on their own personal experience, which no longer was based on the kind of active participation in the formulation of curricular policies and programs and contact with teachers and schools that had earlier been the case.

While the historical profession was thus slowly distancing itself, NCSS was simultaneously criticized as "dominated by historians." This criticism had several targets: the position of history in the schools, the influence of the AHA in NCSS affairs, the historical training and predilections of many of the NCSS leaders, and a general and long-standing fear of "college domination." The latter critics were often disturbed by the lack of sympathy and understanding they felt on the part of many historians with the idea of "the social studies," admittedly a term open to various interpretations which they were attempting to clarify. The AHA itself had, after all, called its last major com-

mission the Commission on the Social Studies and was itself thus supposedly committed to the social studies rather than to history alone. No doubt the failure of the AHA commission to recommend a scope and sequence and the diffused impact of its work contributed to the increasing unease of some historians who suspected that history was either disappearing or was being stretched out of all recognition. This vexed state of affairs would erupt in a controversy during World War II.

During the 1930s, there had been a series of attacks on social studies texts, notably those of Harold O. Rugg. In 1941, a study commissioned by the National Association of Manufacturers published abstracts of 800 social studies textbooks (history, civics, economics, and sociology) bearing on their treatment of private enterprise.[1] While the book cautioned people to read an entire textbook and to consult educators before making public criticisms, the compiler of the abstracts, Professor Ralph W. Robey of Columbia, was not so circumspect. He charged in a story in the New York Times that a "substantial portion" of textbooks criticized our form of government, held the private-enterprise system in contempt, and were poorly written by persons not real authorities in their fields.[2] Spirited protests from NCSS and a number of other educational bodies and condemnations in newspaper editorials resulted in a letter from the NAM president to some 50,000 educators, disavowing Robey's statement and asserting NAM's confidence in American teachers. The upshot was the publication of an NCSS/ NEA manual on the activities of pressure groups, which was included in a packet on meeting such attacks prepared by the NCSS Committee on Academic Freedom.[3]

Many social studies educators feared that when and if the United States entered World War II there would follow similar attacks on social studies textbooks, courses, and teachers. Such fears turned out to be unfounded, although there were plenty of precedents, not only during World War I but in a succession of textbook controversies between the wars. In World War II there was little of the war hysteria that marked World War I. In the 1930s American history textbooks and courses dealt sternly with the assaults on civil liberties during the Great War. Propaganda analysis, which flourished in the 1930s, alerted the unwary to the perils of the manipulation of public opinion. The title of the 1937 NCSS yearbook, Education Against Propaganda, told the story.[4] No

doubt such educational activities and the broader public sentiments on which they rested were partly responsible for the infrequency of attempts at censoring teachers, texts, and courses during World War II, but a more basic reason was the unanimity and cohesion with which the American people supported the war.

As did World War I, World War II heightened interest in citizenship education, one aspect of which was what American children were learning about their own history. The most publicized attack on the social studies during the war came not from the quarters that social educators had expected but from within the ranks of the historical profession. A New York Times article by the American historian Allan Nevins, "American History for Americans," charged that American history was neglected in schools and colleges, that legislative and school requirements on the matter were chaotic, and that "probably the majority of American children never receive a full year's careful work in our national history."[5] The social studies curriculum was one of the villains of the piece. Nevins's position was shortly buttressed by a Times survey of colleges and universities which showed that 82 percent did not require American history for graduation and 72 percent did not require it for admission.[6]

In response to the Nevins article and the Times survey, the Mississippi Valley Historical Review (organ of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association) published a favorable account of the Times survey (although not mentioning Nevins) which called for more and better American history teaching in schools and colleges.[7] In a series of articles, Erling Hunt, editor of Social Education, attacked Nevins's article and the Times survey root and branch. In a public statement adopted at its annual November meeting, NCSS reiterated the importance of American history, chastised the Times survey as "misleading" because of its neglect of other fields of "American study," condemned further legislative regulation of the curriculum as "educationally unsound," and pledged its support to better articulation of "American history in its world setting" in the schools and colleges.[8] The AHA promptly appointed a committee to look into the state of history teaching, especially American history at the college level.[9]

Edgar Wesley, a past president of NCSS, thereupon launched in the pages of the MVHR an unsparing attack on the role of historians.[10]

Wesley first discussed the difficulty of gathering and interpreting educational statistics, pointing out the absence of a standardized terminology. He pointed out, for example, that many 8th-grade courses labeled "social studies" were in fact courses in American history. Wesley concluded that history as such had declined in frequency; that American history had maintained its status; and that historical method, approaches, and evolutionary summaries were used increasingly in all social studies subjects, thus increasing the "aggregate attention to history."

Next, Wesley described forcefully what he believed to be the cause for history's decline: history meets no needs that pupils can appreciate; historians have abrogated their leadership in curriculum-making, have refused to participate in school problems, have generally scorned teaching and demeaned high school history teachers, have slighted their function as trainers of teachers, and as textbook authors have failed to distinguish between history as record and history as instructional material; history began to socialize itself too late and failed to carry the process far enough; and social studies teachers are inferior to those in other subjects, because of the lack of internal standards that would keep out incompetents. If historians wished to do something, Wesley declared, they should not depend upon more statutory requirements, which he believed to be both undesirable and ineffective, but should reverse the trends he had described.

So slashing an attack from a man who was generally favorable to history in the curriculum and whose own textbook for teachers drew consistently on the historical record brought forcefully to the attention of historians a series of indictments that were increasingly widespread among teachers and teacher educators. At the MVHA meeting held the month following the publication of Wesley's article, the association responded to the controversy by setting up a committee to look into the status of history and report by the following October. A rapid closing of ranks ensued. Under the rubric "Committee on American History in the Schools and Colleges," committees with identical personnel were appointed by the AHA, MVHS, and NCSS to make the study, with Wesley as director and with funding from the Rockefeller Foundation. Cochairmen were Theodore C. Blynn, president of MVHS, and Guy Stanton Ford, executive

secretary of the AHA, who had a long-term interest in history teaching.[11]

Just as the committee began its work, the controversy again erupted with the publication in the New York Times of the results of a test administered to 7,000 freshmen in 36 institutions which demonstrated, according to Times education editor Benjamin Fine, "a striking ignorance of even the most elementary aspects of United States history."[12] A Times editorial deplored the ignorance revealed in the test and called for better history teaching. There followed editorials in a number of newspapers, statements in Congress viewing the situation with alarm, and the resignation from the Office of Education of Hugh R. Fraser, who had helped the Times prepare the test, on the grounds of irreconcilable differences between himself and the Office of Education. In the press, Fraser charged that "social study extremists" had "contempt for the facts of American history," specifically singling out NCSS and "its twin brother, Teachers College, Columbia" as the chief culprits.[13] Such charges infuriated the historian Professor Erling M. Hunt of Teachers College, editor of Social Education, disciple of Henry Johnson, and a staunch supporter of history and the social studies, who proceeded to take apart the Times test in the next issue of that magazine.[14]

The controversy demonstrated how wide a gulf had opened between the historical profession and the social studies and how deep was the alarm of many leaders of public opinion over the supposed failures of history teaching and the alleged disappearance of history into the social studies. It also demonstrated the ability of the professional associations of historians and the NCSS to get together in the face of what they perceived as a common crisis.

The publication in 1944 of the AHA/MVHS/NCSS report, American History in the Schools and Colleges, largely vindicated Edgar Wesley's position. The committee administered its own American history test to high school students, military students training in colleges, social studies teachers, Who's Who listees, and other selected adults--the latter including persons not teaching history--and concluded that "understanding of and insight into American history results from slow but nevertheless continuous and persistent growth."[15] Educational realism requires that "at any one level, much may be taught, less will be

learned, and a great deal will subsequently be forgotten"; therefore, the subject should be retaught until the cumulative effect becomes "significant and enduring."[16]

The results of the committee test showed that "Americans do not know their own history as well as they might,"[17] and the report concluded that this was a serious deficiency in view of the values which history contributed to the making of citizens. These values were described as the understanding of continuity and change, understanding the present and planning for the future, and bridging the gap between the individual's limited experience and the complex experience on which our civilization is built. The uses of American history were stressed in providing knowledge of common American experience and aspirations, in preparing future voters for participation in political life, in encouraging a reasoned approach to the solution of complex problems, in nourishing tolerance and appreciation of our diverse population, in giving perspective on current troubles, in demonstrating the problems and consequences of choices between alternative lines of action, and in connecting American history with a world context.

History "is only a guide, not a dictator," the report declared; "it can suggest but not command." Exaggerated claims for the strength and virtues of the nation's history destroy history's values and are ineffective even as propaganda, since students experience life outside as well as inside the school. The study of American history can produce intelligent and cooperative citizens only if the society itself honors citizens who possess these qualities, the report warned.[18]

Having thus described the values of the study of history, the committee concluded that there were sufficient numbers of courses in American history in the schools and colleges, that enrollment in American history courses was almost universal in elementary and junior high schools and so high in the senior high school as to require no program change, but that the percentage of college students studying American history was small and should be increased. The report addressed the problem of articulation among the various levels of teaching by proposing the following major themes: middle grades, "How People Live"; junior high, "Building a Nation"; senior high, "A Democratic Nation in a World Setting"; college level, "American Civilization." For each level

in the schools, major topics and skills were suggested in order to achieve cumulative rather than merely repetitive learning. A separate chapter on college history stressed the importance of good teaching and deplored any tendency to sacrifice teaching to research. The report called not only for articulation among these various levels of American history teaching but for the mutual responsibility of instructors at all levels and for teaching history with an awareness of its relationship to other subjects, especially the other social studies. Teacher training should be upgraded and should include cooperation between departments of history and education and more courses in the social sciences as well as in history. The committee pointed to the value of history outside the school and advocated cooperation between historians and out-of-school agencies in improving it, but cautioned against attempts by organized groups to dictate specific curricula and by legislatures to write the social studies curricula or pass restrictive or punitive laws concerning teachers.[19]

The three parties to the report implemented it somewhat differently. NCSS developed the themes stated in the joint report in much greater detail in its 17th yearbook, The Study and Teaching of American History, adding sections on curricular history, newer interpretations of American history, and evaluation.[20] The volume included an extensive discussion of articulation and the relationship of history and the social studies, as well as cumulative skills development. The MVHR also carried a series of articles elaborating on aspects of the report. The AHA discussed it at the annual meeting but seems to have done little beyond calling it to the attention of AHR readers.

These responses were significant. It was to be expected that the NCSS--most directly concerned with social studies in the schools, to which the bulk of the report was directed--would also be its chief implementer. The Mississippi Valley Historical Association, which dealt only with American history, had an obvious and immediate interest. In addition, the MVHR's "Teachers Section," a regular feature of the journal, offered a ready-made place for discussion of issues concerning curriculum and teaching. The AHR, on the other hand, as a matter of policy harkening from its old agreement with the History Teachers Magazine, did not carry articles on teaching but only notes on professional

activities, including an occasional report on activities or articles concerning teaching. Nevertheless, the AHA had traveled a long way in the decade between its own Commission on the Social Studies and the 1943 joint report. The historical association most closely connected formally with NCSS through Social Education was also the association whose interest in school history and the social studies was dwindling most rapidly. This joint effort on the teaching of American history may have halted for a moment the distancing between the "professional historians" and social studies teaching in the schools, but the halt was only a brief one.

The Indifference of the Other Professional Associations

The other professional social sciences associations took a renewed but essentially peripheral interest in the social studies during World War II. The American Political Science Association had set up a Committee on the Social Studies in 1939 which sponsored several publications, including Teaching of the Civil Liberties (1941),[21] published as an NCSS bulletin, and joint sessions at the annual meetings of APSA and NCSS. Topics of three other NCSS bulletins published during and shortly after the war were local government (1945),[22] political parties and politics (1945),[23] and planning (1948).[24] These were cooperative NCSS ventures with the Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse University. The fairly extensive wartime activities of the APSA on citizenship education, which were directed mostly to adults, gave some attention to the schools, including some publications.

The American Economic Association during the war took a mild interest in curricular matters, continuing a modest earlier trend. It was mainly the introductory college courses, rather than the school curriculum, that engaged the AEA's attention. The organization of professional economists continued its indifferent attitude toward the schools. The banner of economic education was hoisted by another group. In 1948, the Joint Council on Economic Education emerged out of a New York University workshop. Funded by the Committee for Economic Development, a group of liberal businessmen, the workshop was designed to give educational leaders "a comprehensive overview of the American economy and to plan for an appropriate emphasis on economic education in the

schools."[25] This continued to be the thrust of the Joint Council, whose work focused on functional, practical economic questions rather than on theory. The JCEE was essentially an alliance of representatives of business, labor, education, and agriculture devoted to improving economic education through workshops, inservice education, and to a lesser extent by provision of educational materials. Much of this work was carried on through state councils, which were rapidly organized and largely financed by business groups. The fairly frequent articles on the teaching of economics that appeared in Social Education were in large part attributable to the efforts of the Joint Council, which also sponsored joint publications and meetings with NCSS. The JCEE concentrated on its economic thrust, paying scant attention to the social studies curriculum as a whole.

In 1945, the American Sociological Association appointed a Committee on Sociology in the Secondary Schools which arranged several joint sessions with NCSS but did not succeed in creating much interest among sociologists. A decade later the continuing indifference of most sociologists to the secondary school was the subject of an anguished report by the committee chairman, Leslie D. Zeleny, who stated that a letter to 30 leading sociologists inquiring whether they believed that "closer cooperation between the sociological profession and teachers of the Social Studies" was desirable met with a "generally indifferent" response.[26]

Thus the impact of World War II on relationships between the social studies and some of the learned societies was markedly different from that of World War I. The most significant difference was the diminished interest of historians. Out of the curricular controversies and professional association reports during and following World War I, there had emerged the AHA Commission on the Social Studies. No such development occurred during or after World War II. Outside of a few joint meetings with NCSS and a few publications, the associations paid only formal, or minimal, or no attention to the social studies in the schools. The Wesley report on American history and the Joint Council were only minor exceptions.

World War II and Citizenship Education

During the war, controversy over citizenship education in the schools, so far as it involved the professional associations, was focused largely on American history and somewhat less on political science or civics. As had been the case in World War I, there was also increased attention to current events. More formal attention to citizenship education, as it pertained to both foreign and domestic affairs, was exemplified in two NCSS yearbooks on the subject. The 14th yearbook, edited by Erling M. Hunt, Citizens for a New World (1944), focused on planning for peace, international organization and the United Nations, and problems of the postwar world, with some illustrative units, including one on the League of Nations.[27] The kind of citizenship education envisioned by the NCSS was clearly internationalist in character. The type of citizenship education believed essential in domestic affairs was set forth in the 16th yearbook, Democratic Human Relations: Promising Practices in Intergroup and Intercultural Education in the Social Studies (1945), edited by Hilda Taba and William Van Tils and supported by the National Conference of Christians and Jews and the Bureau of Intercultural Education. The volume addressed itself to "the task of building more democratic human relations among America's multiple groups and cultures."[28]

That "more democratic human relations" were badly needed was obvious in the anti-Negro riots in Detroit and elsewhere, attacks on young Mexican Americans, the internment of West Coast Japanese Americans, and some manifestations of anti-Semitism. During a war fought against Nazism and fascism, American educators were deeply concerned about strengthening democracy at home. The "intergroup" and "intercultural" education for citizenship which the NCSS yearbook advocated involved examining and formulating values, helping all "majority and minority groups" to participate fully in American life, encouraging better human relationships in the community, sharing scientific findings, and developing critical thinking. The yearbook focused most strongly on combating prejudice against Negroes and Jews but also included attention to problems encountered by nationality or ethnic groups (such as Poles, Germans, Mexican Americans and Japanese Americans), "lower-class groups,"

and religious groups. Many promising programs that involved all the social studies areas and engaged pupils in investigations, discussion, and action were presented.

In the brief section on philosophy, the 1945 yearbook outlined three possible interpretations of democratic relationships. According to the authors, the "melting pot" in the view of critics involved "an unwholesome standardization" deprecating "the continuation of the foreign heritage." "Cultural pluralism" cherished the ways of minorities but was attacked by critics for sanctioning "undemocratic ways of living." "Cultural democracy," the type favored by the yearbook, cherished the democratic way of life as a common denominator while welcoming "customs and folkways" that enriched American living. However, the authors pointed to the lack of clarity in the latter viewpoint on the extent to which newcomers to a nation or community should adopt "current folkways."[29] The volume also raised questions about how inclusive intergroup education should become.

Both yearbooks were attuned to two major strains of World War II reform thought. The first was international organization and postwar planning. The second, intergroup and intercultural education, partially and uneasily rejected the historic American commitment to the "melting pot" along the lines indicated in the NCSS yearbook. Traditionally, the concept of the "melting pot" had meant that each group contributed its "best" to the national culture, resulting in a continually changing and enriched American civilization with the expectation that distinct nationality groups would eventually disappear through assimilation. It was a theory that focused on the adjustment of new immigrants, with confidence that the future would take care of itself. "Cultural pluralism," a term popularized by the Zionist philosopher Horace Kallen in the 1920s, became somewhat influential in the 1930s as a reaction to the rise of Hitler and "master race" theories abroad. The writings of Kallen and others envisioned a "nation of nations," with indefinite continuation of nationality groups, speaking English as a common language but maintaining their own languages for intragroup purposes. In fact, the "cultural democracy" approach appears to have been an attempt to restate the melting-pot position shorn of its alleged standardization and deprecations. The formulation in the 1945 yearbook is interesting because in

most social studies reform literature up to that time the "melting pot" had been used in its traditional meaning, as a shield against deprecation of newcomers, and as an argument for their full integration into American life. Not until the 1970s, however, would cultural pluralism become the dominant ideology of social studies reform.

The end of World War II, like the end of World War I, brought a renewed interest in the general education of citizens, but this time the outcome was to be very different. The general education movement in the colleges and universities following World War I had resulted not only in the types of "Western Civ" courses pioneered at Columbia University but also in a series of major curricular reorganizations at many colleges and universities which had considerable holding power. The 1945 publication of the Harvard Report, General Education in a Free Society (familiarly known as the "Redbook"), seemed at the time to open a new phase in the history of general education.[30] The "Redbook" sought to distinguish between a student's general education "as a responsible human being and citizen" and the "special education" needed for specific occupations. For the colleges, a general education curriculum was envisioned with a three-divisional core of courses in the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. None was developed. The proposed cores fell victim to faculty specialization, and instead a series of courses "of uneven breadth and originality" ensued.[31] The "Redbook" also advocated proposals of "detached vagueness" in general education for the elementary and secondary schools, in the words of an editorial in Social Education, which, while welcoming its general thrust, warned that the recommendations failed to take into account the diversity of the school population.[32] The 1947 publication of Higher Education for Democracy: The Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education defined general education as "liberal education with its matter and method shifted from its original aristocratic intent to the demands of contemporary society."[33] The commission warned against "excessive specialization," which it attributed to the influence of graduate education.

These reports resulted from and inspired a number of attempts to institute general education programs in higher education which were fairly short-lived or abortive. Among the factors that contributed to

this situation, the most important was probably the growing power of specialization, bolstered by the war. By the mid-1950s the brief resurgence of general education in the universities had subsided.

Citizenship Education Projects: Detroit and Columbia

In secondary education, as in higher education, attention to the general education of citizens increased after World War II. As might be expected, it was more widespread in the schools. One major manifestation was a series of citizenship education projects that provided for active citizenship-by-doing experiences for students. The first was the Detroit Citizenship Education Project headed by Stanley Diamond, a leader of NCSS, which was conducted jointly by Wayne State University and the Detroit Public Schools and financed by the Volker Foundation. The project began in 1945, following the 1943 race riots in Detroit. Taking as its model the "cooperative-curriculum" approach, enlisting the participation of teacher, principals, pupils, and parents, the project attempted to increase "the understanding, interest, competence, and participation of boys and girls in the activities of good citizens so that they will try to be active citizens throughout their lives."[34] The eight schools in the project were selected to represent different types of communities, socioeconomic classes, and racial and ethnic groups.

The major conclusion of the Detroit study was that "the emotional adjustment of pupils is the most important factor in the quality of citizenship for boys and girls." The study found that the schools were teaching the ideals of American democracy effectively, but that there was a need for better understanding of the ways of democracy and for student participation in democratic activities. The schools gave insufficient attention to alternative solutions to social problems, evaluating evidence, critical thinking, and studying contemporary affairs. The effectiveness of schools for citizenship education depended on the unity and teamwork of faculties and their willingness to seek improvement. The need was not for more and better courses: the schools were handling the knowledge component reasonably well. It was the participatory aspects, critical thinking, and developing concern for others that needed strengthening. The most severe and baffling difficulties were encountered in schools in "the lower-economic areas."[35]

The most ambitious of the citizenship projects following World War II was the Citizenship Education Project at Teachers College, Columbia University. The project grew out of the desire of the Carnegie Corporation to contribute to the better education of American citizens and the long-time interest of the dean of Teachers College, William R. Russell, in international education and "learning by doing." Russell believed that the education of citizens required not only book knowledge but emotion and action. The fall of France during the war, a country in which a highly organized system of civic education had been in force for decades, proved his point, he believed. French education had relied solely on book knowledge and had neglected emotion and student involvement, according to Russell.

General George C. Marshall, a new member of the Carnegie board, seems to have first suggested that Carnegie direct its efforts to the secondary schools. Thereafter Dean Russell, with the cooperation of Columbia's new president, Dwight D. Eisenhower, presented a proposal acceptable to Carnegie. The goal was to change citizenship education in all the nation's schools over a 15-year period, to help students become active, responsible citizens through actual, practical citizenship participation--a Deweyan learning-by-doing.

The CEP was based on The Premises of American Liberty, which set forth the core values of American society in relationship to "the free individual," "the free government," "the free economy," and "the free world."[36] Flowing from these themes was a series of suggested "laboratory practices" in which students gathered information and took action on a public matter in the community or school. The practices covered a wide range of topics organized under the categories of law/government/politics, social structure/economic forces, communication/interpersonal relations, and science/technology/agriculture. Examples of specific topics in each of the four categories were the courts, community development, intercultural relations, and conservation. The practices, contained in the famous "Brown Box," were labeled as appropriate for various subject areas, mostly in the social studies, and involved a full panoply of social studies "skills." Many of the laboratory practices could be used today.

The CEP lab practices were widely diffused in the schools, just how widely it is difficult to say. The major weaknesses of the project seem to have been the failure to provide for enough institutional support to the teachers using lab practices and the somewhat sketchy evaluation procedures. In its hasty attempt to be universal, the project spread itself too thin. The CEP came to an end in 1957 with the end of Carnegie funding, which in toto had amounted to more than $2 million. The CEP was probably the most imaginative, and certainly the most ambitious, attempt to translate citizenship education into citizenship action in the history of the social studies.[37]

Neither the Detroit Project nor the CEP was an isolated affair. Learning citizenship by doing it was a favorite topic in the social studies literature of the 1940s and 1950s. The homeroom, school clubs, student government (often attacked as window dressing), community surveys, mock assemblies (including United Nations assemblies), and visits to courts were some of the many activities reported.[38]

Other topics or emphases included in national and local citizenship projects, which were dealt with frequently in the pages of Social Education, were community studies, local history, international education, and race relations or intergroup relations, the latter with most emphasis on the position of Negroes. In the 1950s Social Education emphasized, in addition, economics, area studies (especially of the non-Western world), biography, and education for the gifted or "slow students," with occasional forays into teaching about communism and upgrading teacher preparation. The sources of all of these emphases, insofar as they reflected major social concerns, are not difficult to find: the widespread interest in local community betterment; internationalism, including the "emerging" non-Western world; race problems in the United States and the growing civil rights movement; public concern over allegedly inadequate education for talented pupils (the education of "slower" students developed from historic social studies and school concerns rather than from any public outcry); and the cold war.

Core Curriculum

A related but different type of education for citizenship was the further development of the "core" curriculum, basically a fusion or

combination of two or more school subjects. Rooted in the fusionist efforts of the 1920s, to say nothing of earlier attempts at correlation, the core was a feature of the curricula of many of the progressive schools described in the Eight-Year Study, which took place between 1932 and 1940 and involved some 30 secondary schools, both public and private.[39]

The core curriculum grew after the war, and by the end of the 1940s it had become sufficiently widespread to win a separate listing in the official educational statistics. At that time about 11 percent of junior high schools enrolling more than 500 pupils reported some sort of core curriculum. The most common type was the "unified studies core," in which the disciplines were fused around a single theme or problem drawn from one of them. The usual combination was social studies and English. Individual and group development, subject matter based on pupil needs, and wide latitude for student decisions on what aspect of the central theme to study and how to study it were characteristics of this type. A second was the "experience-centered core," based on the "personal/social needs of adolescents," with clear links to the 1940 Progressive Education Association report. This sometimes involved the prior selection of a problem by the school or by cooperative teacher/parent/student planning. In a more free-floating version, teachers and students worked out the scope of the course in the classroom as they went along. Information and skills were drawn from subject areas when needed. In the 1950s the core program shook itself down to the more conservative "block-time" type, in which two subjects, usually social studies and English, were taught in a single time block and correlated, or supposedly correlated. By the end of the 1950s almost a third of the junior high schools and more than 10 percent of the combined junior-senior high schools had some form of core or block time.[40]

The core was a diffuse movement that ranged from imaginative and well-based curricula involving active student participation to blatant anti-intellectualism. It was, in a sense, the best and worst of subjects. The conceptual problem in combining subjects within the social studies had always been a difficult one that remained largely unresolved. While the general education courses in the colleges between the wars, especially "Western Civ," offered some guidance to the schools,

those developing after World War II did not. When to the usual problems of fusing the social studies were added subjects not so obviously related, the difficulties became even more formidable. The "personal/social needs of adolescents" approach could easily degenerate into sloppier forms of "life adjustment" or into a formless curriculum from which students learned little and which bored them. Core made unusually tough demands on teachers, while scheduling block-time classes (without benefit of computers) was a laborious business for the schools. On the other hand, when well conceived and well taught, the core, like other fusionist attempts, could result in a stimulating course in which students were able to grasp new relationships. The longer time blocks required for core made possible more flexibility in teaching and learning.[40]

Changing Reform Characteristics

Several earlier characteristics of social studies reform were notable by their absence in the 1940s and 1950s. Calls for general reform of the scope and sequence of the social studies curriculum were few, and the position taken by the AHA Commission on the Social Studies--that scope and sequence was the business of the local school system--held. The usual references to "coherence" or "confusion" in the curriculum were not accompanied by proposals for national curriculum review or recommendations on scope and sequence. Perhaps the prospect was too formidable or the belief in the efficacy and need for local products was too strong. But the most likely explanation is the fact that most topics or emphases could, with a bit of stretching and hauling, be accommodated within the existing framework.

Another notable absence was the history of the social studies itself. Whereas before the war references to the historical development of the social studies had been fairly standard, both in methods texts and in general articles, after the war they became less and less frequent. A modest historiographical tradition had been under way earlier, but the work of historians like Tryon and Johnson--both mature scholars nearing the end of their careers when their AHA Commission on the Social Studies volumes were published--was not further expanded. Aside from a

few doctoral dissertations and an occasional article, the history of the social studies languished. Certainly the distancing of most of the leaders of the historical profession from the social studies, from interest in general education, and from teaching was one of the reasons. The increasing specialization in the profession did not include specialization in social studies history: "social studies" and "education" were becoming terms of opprobrium. Nor was the history of the social studies pursued by teacher educators in the Tryon/Johnson mold. There were many traces remaining, but there was little new work. The oral tradition handed down by the early participants in social studies reform movements faded as many of the pioneering leaders retired or died. Thus the social studies reformers were fast losing their own past, which existed in dimming memories and which was unrefreshed by the vigorous new investigations and interpretations needed in a living historiography.

References

1. Abstracts of Social Science Textbooks (New York: National Association of Manufacturers, 1941).

2. New York Times, February 22, 1941.

3. National Council for the Social Studies, Control of Social Studies Textbooks (Washington, D.C.: Research Division of the National Education Association, 1941). For a further account of the controversy, see Louis M. Vaneria, "The National Council for the Social Studies: A Voluntary Organization for Professional Service" (Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1958), pp. 242-46.

4. Elmer Ellis, ed., Education Against Propaganda: Developing Skill in the Use of the Sources of Information about Public Affairs (Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1937).

5. Allan Nevins, "American History for Americans," New York Times Magazine, May 3, 1942.

6. New York Times, June 21, 1942.

7. Philip D. Jordan, "The New York Times Survey of United States History," Mississippi Valley Historical Review 29 (September 1942), pp. 238-242.

8. Social Education 7 (June 1943), pp. 28-29.

9. "Report of the Executive Secretary for the Year 1942," American Historical Review 48 (April 1943), p. 464.

10. Edgar Wesley, "History in the High School Curriculum," Mississippi Valley Historical Review 29 (March 1943), pp. 565-575.

11. Edgar Wesley, American History in the Schools and Colleges (New York: Macmillan, 1944), pp. v-xii (hereafter cited as Wesley, Am. Hist.).

12. New York Times, April 4, 1943.

13. New York Times, April 11, 1943.

14. Erling M. Hunt, "The New York Times 'Test' on American History," Social Education 7 (May 1943), pp. 195-200, 240.

15. Wesley, Am. Hist., p. 11.

16. Ibid., p. 12.

17. Ibid., p. 4.

18. Ibid., pp. 14-24.

19. Ibid., pp. 118-121.

20. Richard Z. Thursfield, ed., The Study and Teaching of American History (Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies 1947).

21. Howard E. Wilson et al., Teaching of the Civil Liberties (Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies 1941).

22. Donald G. Bishop and Edith E. Starrett, The Structure of Local Government (Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies; Syracuse: Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University, 1945).

23. Marguerite J. Fisher and Edith E. Starrett, Parties and Politics in the Local Community (Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies; Syracuse: Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University, 1945).

24. Donald G. Bishop et al., Community Planning in a Democracy (Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies; Syracuse: Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University, 1948).

25. Summary Report of the Joint Council on Economic Education, 1948-1951 (New York: JCEE, no date).

26. Leslie D. Zeleny, "Report of the Committee on Liaison with the National Council for the Social Studies," American Sociological Review 20 (February 1955), pp. 101-102.

27. Erling M. Hunt, ed., Citizens for a New World (Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies 1944).

28. Hilda Taba and William Van Tils, eds., Democratic Human Relations: Promising Practices in Intergroup and Intercultural Education in the United States (Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies), p. 352.

29. Ibid., pp. 346-47.

30. General Education in a Free Society (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1945).

31. Frederick Rudolph, Curriculum: A History of the American Undergraduate Course of Study (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977), pp. 257-264.

32. "The Harvard Report," Social Education 10 (February 1946), pp. 53-54.

33. Higher Education for Democracy: The Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education (New York: Harper and Bros., 1948).

34. Stanley E. Diamond, Schools and the Development of Good Citizens (Detroit: Wayne University Press, 1953), pp. 12, 245.

35. Ibid., p. 207.

36. The Premises of American Liberty (New York: Citizenship Education Project, Teachers College, 1952).

37. For a detailed history of the CEP, see Richard W. Streb, "A History of the Citizenship Education Project: A Model Curricular Study" (Ed.D. dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1979).

38. See, for example, Laura M. Shufelt, ed., Developing Citizenship Through School Activities (Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1949).

39. Wilfred N. Aiken, The Story of the Eight Year Study (New York: Harper and Bros., 1942).

40. See Grace S. Wright, Core Curriculum in Public High Schools (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing office 1950); and Block-Time Classes and the Core Program in the Junior High School (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1958).

40. See Hazel W. Hertzberg, Historical Parallels for the Sixties and Seventies: Primary Sources and Core Curriculum Revisited (Boulder, Colo.: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education and Social Science Education Consortium, 1971).

5. THE ORIGINS OF THE "NEW SOCIAL STUDIES" IN THE 1950S

The 1950s--Rumblings and Reform

By the mid-1950s general education, in the form of citizenship education and the core, was beginning to run out of creative energy. Its continued dominance in social studies reform was due more to momentum from the past than to a reformulation for the future. In both the schools and colleges, general education, citizenship and core, while having deep historical roots, had been buoyed by the war and by the period immediately following. They were responses to the 1940s rather than to the 1950s.

The New Critique of the Schools

While reform in the social studies thus continued on its course, there began in the early 1950s a critique of the schools that would eventuate in an enormous national effort to retrain teachers, reform teacher education, and eventually to affect curriculum change through the creation of new curricular materials. The critics were journalists and intellectuals from the university, drawn largely from outside the educational establishment of the schools, who charged that the schools offered an education inadequate for the citizens of a great power with world responsibilities. Especially in mathematics, the sciences, and languages, American schools were deemed inferior to European schools in general and to those of the USSR in particular. The critics rarely mentioned that the European education they praised reflected class systems much more rigid than that of the United States. It was education for an elite that was rapidly and irrevocably separated at the beginning

of adolescence from most students, who went to trade or vocational schools. In a sense, this European ideal of the new reformers represented a Sneddenist type of social efficiency--one education for "the rank and file," another for leaders--except that the leadership education was often much more "liberal" than Snedden had advocated. In contrast to the situation in Europe, the allegation ran, in American schools the curriculum was soft, many students couldn't read, able students were neglected, and teachers were ill prepared. The critics, whose books and articles were widely published, found a ready response, especially from the rising young professionals who were moving to the suburbs with their growing families and who then busied themselves in reforming the local schools. These professionals wanted schools that would offer excellence in academic subjects and were less concerned with student involvement in social issues.

This powerful meshing of perceived American needs, both foreign and domestic, soon began to get results. The National Science Foundation, which had been founded in 1950, started to support inservice training for teachers of mathematics and science. By 1957 six major national projects had been established in these fields, and a consensus had emerged which was based on the primacy and integrity of the disciplines. First, the focus was on the individual academic disciplines and their "structures"--that is, their models, theories, concepts, generalizations, and methods of investigation. The "inquiry" or "discovery" method used by scholars in the disciplines to generate new knowledge and ideas was also believed to be the best way for students of the disciplines to learn, one that would stimulate their interest and encourage the transfer of learning. In essence, these were updated versions of the problem-solving or "scientific" method and the old-time "disciplinary" value of the subjects earlier based in faculty psychology. Second, the place to begin was the high school, where the individual disciplines were most firmly ensconced. Third, the students to be addressed were the "gifted and talented," those who were believed to be most neglected and who represented an essential national resource. Fourth, the most efficient way to change education was to change the materials of instruction. Fifth, the vehicle for providing the needed materials was the project, directed by a recognized scholar from a discipline and staffed

by experts who might include teachers, administrators, and professors of education as members or consultants. Sixth, inservice education of teachers was necessary if the new materials were to be used effectively. In short, an educational revolution was to be achieved through carefully designed and tested materials in the individual disciplines, created and directed by the best and the brightest.

Primarily, this response represented a consensus of scientists whose disciplines had been the theme of most of the critiques of the 1950s. So ambitious a program required money in much larger amounts than had yet been supplied. The Soviet launching of Sputnik in October 1957 uncorked the funds. Projects based on the consensus multiplied rapidly.

Consensus History--a New View of America's Past

The social studies had not figured prominently in the attacks of the 1950s nor in the remedies suggested, although they were rather vaguely associated with the purported sins of life adjustment. During the 1950s, however, there were developing in the universities two major forces that would affect the new movement when it finally reached the social studies. The first was the increasing attention to the social sciences, especially the behavioral sciences, which accelerated during the war and resulted in gains in power, prestige, and students in the period that followed. In 1949 the social sciences accounted for some 10 percent of the bachelors' degrees awarded; in 1955 the figure was about 14 percent. During the same period, history's gains were more modest, from just under 3 percent in 1949 to just over 3 percent in 1955.[1] From these students would come most of the leaders of the "new social studies" projects of the 1960s.

The second factor was the emergence by the mid-1950s of a new school of historical interpretation consonant with the spirit of the age. "Consensus history," as it came to be called, represented a revolt against Beard and the progressive historians who had earlier dominated the profession and who had played so significant a role in the social studies. If the "new history" had been a historical response to progressive reform and many of its proponents had been social activists,

consensus history was a historical response to more complacent times, appealing for conservation of the status quo with some modest changes and encouraging the historian to be not an activist but an observer. The new school offered a smoothed-out version of the American past, one which emphasized its continuities and agreements. While both progressive and consensus historians believed in progress and in the uniqueness of the American experience, they had very different notions of why and how these had been achieved. The uniqueness of the American past, in the progressive view, had consisted of the ability of the American people to extend and deepen the meaning of democracy through a long and never-ending series of struggles of the many against the few. The uniqueness of the American past, in the consensus view, was the ability of the American people to resolve their differences peaceably and to arrive at a viable consensus, aided by the absence of such European institutions as feudalism and by the munificence of our national resources. The consensus historians tended to rest their case in circumstances that could not be duplicated and thus to remove the American past from relevance to the contemporary struggle of developing nations for independence and economic and social justice. They offered not only a reasonably harmonious history that downplayed conflict but one that looked rather askance at the efforts of past reformers and tended to deprecate them, or at least to remove them from their previous central and stellar role. Although the consensus historians were bitterly critical of what they believed to be such educational monstrosities as "life adjustment," the history they presented came perilously close to being an intellectual's life-adjustment interpretation of the American past. This was not history that encouraged historians to revive efforts at reforming the schools, especially since history was so well established therein. In the 1950s, when adolescent rebellion was not directed to reforming society, it was less obvious than it later became that consensus history tended to cut off the young from finding in the past of their own country the roots or counterparts of their own struggles and rebellions, a further consequence that would emerge only in the turbulent 1960s. In the 1950s the models once provided by the reformers were replaced by a transformation of robber barons into industrial statesmen, while the progressive reformers were cut down to size

as nostalgic seekers after a slipping status they had once enjoyed in an older, small-town America. Other post-World-War-II developments within history of consequence for the social studies were the stress on immigration history and the growth of area studies. The former was a sort of historical version of the intergroup movement. The latter was an historical response to a much deeper U.S. involvement in the "non-Western world," which in turn resulted in the growth of area studies programs in higher education.

Arthur Bestor: History vs. Social Studies

Despite their fading interest, in the 1950s it was the historians rather than the social scientists whose own past drew them closest to the schools and the social studies. Appropriately, it was a historian who, during this period, made the most influential critique of the social studies, one that reflected uneasiness about what was happening to school history and considerable ambivalence about the social sciences. Arthur Bestor, a University of Illinois historian, had been educated at the Lincoln School at Teachers College, Columbia, in its progressive glory days or, as he viewed it, before progressive education became regressive education. (When Bestor was a student there, the recently introduced social studies course was derisively called by the some students "social stew.") Bestor had also been a faculty member of the Department of Social Studies at Teachers College, where he taught "content" rather than "methods" courses. In the early 1950s he attempted to revive the AHA's former interest in the schools, along the lines of the emerging 1950s critique, by emphasizing the integrity of the disciplines and the intellectual mission of the schools. His Educational Wastelands: The Retreat From Learning in Our Public Schools (1953)[2] was followed by The Restoration of Learning: A Program for Redeeming the Unfulfilled Promise of American Education (1955), which incorporated large chunks of his earlier book.[3]

Bestor addressed himself to the whole of the American educational system, not to the social studies alone. He was a strong supporter of the public school, and he rested his case not on American competition with the Soviet Union but on the need to assert the primacy of intel-

lectual values in education, which he believed essential to a democratic society. Bestor stated specifically that he had chosen to examine not the actual situation in the schools but the "educational blueprints" of the "professional educationists," an "interlocking directorate" of administrators, professors of education, educational bureaucrats in state and national government, and their various organizations. This unholy alliance, which diverted progressive education from its earlier alliance with the scholarly disciplines and invested it with a pervasive anti-intellectualism, would, if allowed to proceed unchecked, fatally damage the public school system and lower the intellectual goals of the whole nation. In fact, however, Bestor's book was full of statements about the sorry state of American schools, as he forgot the distinction he had made between educationist blueprints and classroom realities.

Bestor believed that liberal education for all, slow students as well as able ones, consisted of training in the scholarly disciplines. In the secondary schools these consisted of mathematics, science, history, English, and foreign languages. These should be systematically taught as separate disciplines with their own ways of thinking, methods of investigation, and organized structures of knowledge. Integration should not be attempted in the schools or in introductory college courses, since synthesis depends on prior analysis and an organized body of knowledge to synthesize.

The term "social studies" should be abolished, Bestor urged, since it was unnecessary and because it led to educational faddism, trivia, and confusion. Fortunately, Bestor stated, most social science courses in the schools were actually history; however, the term should be dropped before it was too late. History, Bestor believed, was essential for the education of citizens because it promoted the perspectives on change which were essential to a changing society. The study of contemporary events alone was suitable only for a static society. History also was a necessary corrective to the contemporaneity of the social sciences, from which it differed radically because of its immersion in change through time and its methods of investigation. The problem lay not with the social sciences, however, since they had rarely, if ever, attempted to displace history in the schools. Bestor did not suggest changing the current social studies scope and sequence, which he regarded as a work-

able if not very satisfactory arrangement. As for the NCSS, Bestor believed that it contained no adequately organized opposition to "the extravagant partisans of contemporaneity." He urged the formation of a separate history teachers' association with which the historians would deal directly, although he did not suggest that they withdraw their support from NCSS.

Insofar as the social studies were concerned, Bestor's own historical clock stopped with the 1916 NEA report, which he regarded as the work of "educationists." He did not deal with the historical development of the social studies thereafter, failing even to mention the AHA Commission on the Social Studies. It is not possible that these matters were unknown to him. By thus removing the rise of the social studies from the historical context, he obviated the necessity of coming to grips with the meaning and problems of their historical development and made it possible to advocate a course of action which ignored them. In short, Bestor's book exhibited the perils of "extravagant contemporaneity" which he deplored.[4]

Like other 1950s critics, Bestor's particular bete noire was "life adjustment," which seemed to illustrate much of the fatuity of the educationists. He drew his major examples from the report of an Illinois commission, The Schools and National Security (1951), from whose pronouncements he plucked many horrifying examples of anti-intellectualism particularly related to the social studies, thus linking the two.[5]

Teacher education, Bestor urged, should be based on sound liberal education and should be largely removed from the hands of the educationists in a process of "devolution" by which the disciplines would be returned to their home departments, leaving pedagogy as the basic business of schools and departments of education. Certification in the subjects should ideally be granted on the basis of a state examination, while certification in teaching proficiency should be acquired by practice teaching, by presenting satisfactory evidence of successful teaching, or by interning in schools designated for the purpose.

Bestor's book, while it contained many cogent criticisms of American education, was unfair and unbalanced. It was both a polemical tract and a penetrating critique. It was also an influential one. In the service of his campaign to revitalize intellectual values and the pri-

macy of the disciplines in the schools, Bestor was highly selective in his use of evidence, most of it negative. The controversy blurred the distinctions between "educational blueprints" and school practice, leaving the impression that they were identical. To historians Bestor offered an appealing morality play of a golden age of history in the schools which was subsequently destroyed or at least threatened by educationists bent on imposing social activism and life adjustment. Essentially, it was much the same picture of the social studies that the critics of history advanced, with the heroes and villains reversed. Why and how history had managed to survive so powerful an onslaught or even why the social studies had developed at all, Bestor did not ask. Had he attempted a more searching historical analysis, he might have alerted historians to some of the problems that would shortly beset history and the "new social studies." Instead, he helped to demean and discredit in the eyes of historians all social studies educators, including those who had most faithfully attempted to improve the teaching of history and sought to achieve some reasonable balance among the social studies subjects.

In 1956 Bestor helped to found the Council for Basic Education, which is dedicated to the primacy of intellectual and moral development in the schools by strengthening the academic curriculum. Among the 135 charter members there was a strong contingent of historians, among them Samuel Flagg Bemis, Ray S. Billington, Crane Brinton, Solon J. Buck, Richard N. Current, Frank Friedel, Louis M. Hacker, Carleton J.H. Hayes, Richard Hofstadter, W. Stull Holt, Allan Nevins, and Henri Peyre. The presence of this distinguished group demonstrated a considerable degree of historical concern over the state of affairs in the schools. CBE's charter members also included the publisher Alfred A. Knopf, the philosopher William Ernest Hocking, the literary critic Howard Mumford Jones, the drama critic Joseph Wood Krutch, and the social critic Peter Viereck. The attack on the schools was obviously winning many converts among leading intellectuals. The CBE's Bulletin delightedly roasted the educationists, carried many specific examples of their follies, and reported on promising developments.[6]

In the latter part of the decade both the American Historical Association and NCSS moved to take account of the demand for more and

better attention to the disciplines and to academically talented students. In 1957 the AHA established the Service Center for Teachers of History to offer historical services to schools. Its chief activity was the publication of a series of pamphlets designed to acquaint teachers with new historical scholarship.

NCSS Responses to the Critics

The response of NCSS was, of course, more extensive and complex. One line of response dealt with a differentiated education for "gifted" and "slow" students, the latter being of only peripheral interest to the 1950s critics but of considerable continuing interest to social studies educators. Another approach, which continued throughout the 1950s, urged a better and more academically based education for teachers and tightened certification requirements. A third, addressed directly to the disciplinary thrust, attempted to acquaint teachers with the latest disciplinary scholarship. The publication of the 1958 NCSS yearbook, edited by Roy A. Price, New Viewpoints in the Social Sciences,[7] was a clear demonstration that the ferment over education for excellence, the primacy of the individual disciplines, and the importance of science (here represented by the social sciences) was now heaving and bubbling in the social studies. It also foreshadowed some of the problems that were to arise. The disciplinary contributions to this volume came from a wide range of social sciences, including some unrepresented in the curriculum. By and large, the social science contributors were unacquainted with the schools or their curricula, even in their own disciplines. The social studies contributors, on the other hand, were in somewhat of a quandary about how all this was to be accommodated to the traditional social studies purpose of citizenship education, the traditional concern about education for all youth, "gifted" or not, and the traditional curricular scope and sequence.

New Viewpoints in the Social Sciences presented essays by scholars in history, geography, political science, economics, sociology, anthropology, sociology, and social psychology. These contributors summarized major trends in the disciplines, but only in the essays on history and anthropology were their educational implications explored explicitly or

at any length. The contributor for political science did not even mention the schools or the social studies--surely an extraordinary omission, considering the place of civics/civil government in the curriculum. One could not infer from most of these essays that economics and sociology, for example, were actually school subjects. A series of concluding chapters paid more-explicit attention to the role of the social studies in international relations, educational methods (the authors found little evidence of direct or conscious use of social science methodologies in teaching), and psychological influences on social studies teaching. A concluding section on the future of the social studies, by Earl Johnson, focused on the importance of the education of the teacher, advocating a broad general education supplemented by professional courses, a master's degree as the minimum requirement for entry into the profession, and continuing education during active teaching thereafter. The type of education for both teachers and pupils which the author had in mind is indicated by his emphasis on the primacy of moral/intellectual values and their critical and reflective examination; by his conception of teaching/learning, liberally quoting from Dewey, as a transaction between "reliable and useful knowledge" and the "need for knowledge" in the unfolding development of the student; and by his insistence on attention to all students, academically talented or not. Johnson suggested that NCSS might consider further how the social science disciplines could cooperate.

Interpreting and Teaching American History, edited by William H. Cartwright and Richard L. Watson, Jr., the 31st NCSS yearbook (published in 1961), followed a similar format.[8] The primary aim of the 1961 yearbook was "to encourage critical thinking through the interpretive approach." This theme was presented in a series of essays by prominent historians which covered interpretations of successive periods in American history. The presence of Arthur Bestor no doubt reflected the efforts of NCSS to bring its erstwhile critics into camp. The implications for teaching in section 2 of the volume contained many suggestions for incorporating the interpretive approach into the elementary and secondary school. The chapter on the middle grades in the elementary school deals in part with the importance of developing time relationships, a theme not further pursued in discussions of the upper grades.

As usual, contributors warned of the need for articulation among the different levels at which American history was taught. The use of primary sources in instruction, which would become a major theme of the historical wing of the "new social studies" movement of the 1960s, was discussed only briefly.

The most determined and extensive NCSS effort to strengthen its links with university scholarship during this period was a cooperative project, beginning in 1958, with the American Council of Learned Societies. The outcome was a joint ACLS/NCSS volume, published in 1963, entitled The Social Sciences and the Social Studies.[9] ACLS obtained contributions from scholars in the various social science disciplines as well as in two area studies fields, each of which attempted to set forth what a high school graduate should know about his subject. They also made suggestions about the places of their disciplines in the curriculum. The historian and the political scientist agreed on history as the curricular core; the anthropologist advocated a dispersion of anthropological concepts throughout the curriculum; the geographer observed that the necessary knowledge and understanding of world affairs were not well served by using behavioral concepts in a historical framework; the economist advocated economics for "responsible citizenship"; the sociologist suggested a "functional orientation" to tie together diverse sociological topics; the psychologist addressed attitudes and abilities as psychologists viewed them.

The introduction by Bernard Berelson, of the Population Council, raised a number of issues. The "conflict" between the aims of the social studies to produce either good citizens or students knowledgeable in the social science disciplines was "largely spurious," Berelson believed. It could be resolved by giving students the best introduction to the best available knowledge as a means to the end of producing responsible citizens. Berelson also pointed to three "special aspects" of the contributions: the recognition of cultural diversity, the emphasis on student acquisition of a critical stance about what he knows, and the desirability of giving students some familiarity with the research methods of the disciplines. Several issues peculiar to the social studies, Berelson believed, were student readiness to engage in the tasks suggested, the role of values and controversy due to the sensitiv-

ity of the social studies to matters of public and even personal policy, and the unusually knotty problem of curricular organization, due to the federated nature of the social studies and the complex interrelationships of the disciplines. On several issues the contributors were in agreement, Berelson reported. Given a choice between breadth and depth, they opted for the latter. They also agreed that the secondary school curriculum should stand on its own feet, not be a watered-down version of the college program.

The "Afterword" by Lewis Paul Todd, then editor of Social Education, defined the basic purpose of the social studies as "the development of desirable socio-civic behavior" and distinguished between the social studies and the social sciences on the basis of this purpose. Todd urged setting up a well-funded national commission on curriculum revision, involving scholars from the social sciences, the curriculum, and the psychology of teaching as well as classroom teachers and preferably operating on a more or less permanent basis.

Outside of a few allusions to the "outdated" 1916 NEA report by Berelson and some of Todd's observations, the contributors to the ACLS/NCSS volume seemed to have been simply unaware that the issues they raised had ever been seriously considered before. Even the work of the AHA Commission on the Social Studies, which had dealt with most of these questions, had disappeared into oblivion. The recent efforts at active learning-by-doing citizenship were likewise ignored. Insofar as national reform was concerned, the social studies were divested of their own past, both recent and not-so-recent, more completely that at any time in their historical development. Yet, the curriculum, teaching methods, and materials of instruction in the schools were clearly products of this past, and if the changes proposed were to be effective, reformers would have to take this circumstance into account. The outlook for doing so was, however, decidedly unpromising.

Beginnings of the "New" Curricular Reforms

If the contributors to the ACLS/NCSS volume largely ignored the past, they also seemed oblivious to a portentous development then under way. This was the rise of new curricular projects in the social

studies, well begun by 1962. Patterned after those in mathematics and the sciences, the school subjects most remote from citizenship education, the new projects were strongly influenced by Jerome Bruner's short and influential volume, The Process of Education (1960), which summarized the basic principles of curricular reform in mathematics and science and exemplified the forces that supported them.[10]

Bruner's book was a report of a conference held at Woods Hole, Massachusetts, in the fall of 1959. The participants were largely university-based scientists, and sponsorship and funding were provided by the National Academy of Sciences, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the Carnegie Corporation, the U.S. Air Force, the Rand Corporation, the U.S. Office of Education, and the National Science Foundation. By the end of the 1950s the critique of the schools had thus crystallized in a powerful triumvirate of universities, private foundations, and government. Largely excluded were classroom teachers and "educationists."

The basic principles Bruner set forth in The Process of Education were as follows:

--Students can learn how to learn; massive transfer of learning can be achieved.

--The disciplines have distinctive "structures" that students can learn, or discover, which tie together discrete knowledge so that it can be more effectively gained and retained.

--Mastery of the fundamental ideas of a field involves not only general principles but the development of an attitude towards learning; that is, learning by "inquiry" or "discovery."

--Since intellectual inquiry is everywhere the same, the "schoolboy" can learn more easily by behaving as a social scientist.

--Any subject can be effectively taught in some honest form to any child at any level.

In these propositions lay the key to student readiness, motivation, and intellectual rigor, to sequential learning and curriculum structure, and to methods of teaching.

Equipped with these ideas, the mathematics and science projects focused on reforming the curriculum through reforming curriculum materials, using funds that were plentiful after Sputnik. These materials,

made possible by rapidly developing technology, were carefully designed, field tested, and redesigned, and teachers were instructed in their use. Their legacy of curricular reform to the social studies was a well-integrated and powerful ideology, a particular form of project organization and procedures designed to implement it, and major sources of funding in private foundations and especially in government.

The period in which this legacy was shaped was, of course, the 1950s, during the administration of President Dwight D. Eisenhower, a period in which many intellectuals felt themselves to be on the outside looking in. Their candidate in the 1950s, Adlai Stevenson, had just been defeated. In educational reform the Eisenhower administration had concentrated on mathematics, science, and foreign languages, all conceived to be critical for the world position of the United States. With the election of President John F. Kennedy, intellectuals hitherto excluded saw themselves as at last moving toward the center of power. And not only for intellectuals was this a time of soaring hope. Millions of other Americans were persuaded that they stood on the edge of a "new frontier," on whose far side there awaited exhilarating challenges. It was in this heady atmosphere of the early 1960s that the new reform movement in social studies education arose, profoundly influenced by the critiques of the 1950s and by the resulting reform direction already set in mathematics and the natural sciences.

At the beginning of the 1960s, as we have seen, the dominant wing of social science reform represented by NCSS had embraced a greater emphasis on contributions from the academic disciplines, attention to the academically gifted student, and better teacher training and certification, albeit raising serious questions about how some of these matters were to be handled so as to strengthen or preserve the citizenship purposes, general education for all students, the scope and sequence of the curriculum, and other traditional professional concerns. It must be remembered that the social studies leaders were inveterate critics of the status quo, with a long history of fighting to improve the curriculum, teaching, and learning; but they defended the social studies against what they believed were exaggerated attacks. They were experts at initiating and accommodating new societal pressures on the curriculum. What they were unprepared to do, however, was to yield up

reform to a group quite outside social studies education whose contacts and experience with the schools were minimal or nonexistent.

What was missing in the reform equation at the opening of the 1960s was a direct and specific linkage of social studies reform to the ideology and procedures of the powerful projects in mathematics and science. This was supplied by Charles R. Keller, formerly a professor of history and director of the American Placement Program, at that time head of the John Hays Fellows Program.[11] Keller called for a "revolution" in the social studies comparable to that occurring in mathematics, science, English, and foreign languages. He argued that the present unhappy situation was due in part to the fact that the social studies were not "a subject" but "a federation of subjects" that were often merged in confusing ways. (To his list of the traditional subjects, Keller added psychology and anthropology.) The "revolution," Keller believed, should begin by eliminating the murky term "social studies" and substituting for it the more exact "history and the social sciences." The curriculum based on the 1916 NEA report had not been revised for decades, in spite of the changes in the world. Articulation in the social studies was particularly inadequate, most noticeably in American history. Too many teachers emphasized the creation of good citizens rather than the disciplines. Attitudes could not be taught in a formal classroom. Rather, students should become acquainted with facts and ideas and learn how to think and understand. They should know how historians and social scientists go about their work. Hopefully, they would then develop democratic attitudes for themselves and become good citizens. Keller urged that courses stress the unique structure of subjects, using the conceptual rather than the fact-by-fact approach. The emphasis should be on learning and discovery rather than on teaching--on analysis, critical thinking, and interpretation. Keller called for piercing "the sheepskin curtain" between the colleges and the schools.

Keller's conception of the revolution needed in the social studies thus linked reform--or "revolution"--directly to Bruner's principles. But Keller spoke as an individual, without the weight of the historical profession behind him. While many historians might sympathize with his views, as a profession their interest was marginal. They were, after

all, doing their duty through the Service Center for Teachers of History. It was not the professional historical associations but those of the "newer" social sciences who would sponsor projects in their disciplines. The learned societies of history and political science, which as school subjects were well established at the heart of the curriculum, remained largely aloof.

References

1. Hazel Whitman Hertzberg, "The Teaching of History," in Michael Kammen, ed., The Past Before Us: Contemporary Historical Writing in the United States (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980), p. 488.

2. Arthur Bestor, Educational Wastelands: The Retreat from Learning in Our Public Schools (Urbana, Ill.: Illinois University Press, 1953).

3. Arthur Bestor, The Restoration of Learning: A Program for Redeeming the Unfulfilled Promise of American Education (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1956).

4. For a critique of Bestor from a social studies and historical viewpoint, see Leo J. Alilunias, "Bestor and the 'Social Studies,'" Social Education 22 (May 1956), pp. 238-240.

5. Charles W. Sanford, Harold C. Hand, and Willard B. Spalding, The Schools and National Security (Illinois Secondary School Curriculum Program, Bulletin no. 26, May 1951).

6. For a history of the CBE and extracts from the Bulletin, see Mortimer Smith, ed., A Decade of Comment on Education, 1956-1966 (Washington, D.C.: Council for Basic Education, 1966).

7. Roy A. Price, ed., New Viewpoints in the Social Sciences (Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies 1958).

8. William H. Cartwright and Richard L. Watson, Jr., eds., Interpreting and Teaching American History (Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1961).

9. Bernard Berelson, ed., The Social Sciences and the Social Studies (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1962).

10. Jerome Bruner, The Process of Education (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960).

11. Charles R. Keller, "Needed: Revolution in the Social Studies," Saturday Review, September 16, 1961.

6. THE "NEW SOCIAL STUDIES"

Social Studies Curricular Reform--Private and Public Support

A significant group of new projects in the social studies was already under way even as Keller called for a revolution. One of the earliest, and that most closely aligned with the citizenship purposes of social studies education, was directed to the analysis of public issues. Located at the Harvard School of Education, it was headed by Donald Oliver. Several others in history, economics, and geography were much closer than the Harvard Project to the Brunerian approach, including initiatives by disciplinary professors rather than "educationists." Not surprisingly, two history projects, one at Amherst College and one at Carnegie-Mellon, focused on the use of primary sources. The first, which included a group of colleges in the area and cooperating local schools, was headed by Van R. Halsey of Amherst; it was working on units for the 11th-grade American history course. The second, headed by Edwin Fenton of Carnegie-Mellon, was working in history with able students in a local Pittsburgh school.

Another project, which involved teaching economics to elementary school students in Elkhart, Indiana, was then, and remained, something of a maverick in the nascent movement. Its creator, Lawrence Senesh, an economics professor at Purdue University, was well acquainted with the work of John Dewey, his father having been in charge of a Deweyan school in Senesh's native Hungary.

Geography was represented by the beginnings of the High School Geography Project. Unlike the other projects, this one involved a somewhat uneasy alliance between the geographic professional association,

the Association of American Geographers, and the geographic educational association, the National Council for Geographic Education. Their joint committee was supported in 1961 by the Ford Foundation's Fund for the Advancement of Education as a clearly discipline-centered project, but one with a broad interpretation of just what "discipline-centered" might mean.

All of these projects were to become important components of social studies reform in the 1960s. Largely locally based in universities and colleges, led by scholars from the disciplines, focused on traditional school subjects, and funded by private foundations, they were clearly responses to the 1950s critique.

The massive government support of social studies--or social science--projects began in 1961, along lines already established in mathematics and science. The outpouring of government money for social studies reform was so much greater than it had ever been before as to create a situation virtually without precedent. If the government and its purse had not created the ideas of the movement now taking shape, it certainly supplied the cash for their implementation. Government helped to call into being a new force--the projects and their developers--who necessarily had to have entrepreneurial as well as other formidable skills. This is not to imply that the new projects were concerned solely or mainly with money, but their continued existence did depend on tapping into a cash flow. The tradition thus established was to outlive the particular type of social studies reforms originally financed.

In 1961 the National Science Foundation funded two new curriculum projects in the behavioral sciences, signaling major governmental support for a social science thrust. Anthropology was represented by the Anthropology Curriculum Study Project of the American Anthropological Association, headed by Malcolm Collier, and sociology by the American Sociological Association's Sociological Resources for the Secondary School (later "for the Social Studies"), directed by Robert C. Feldmesser. Anthropology had not previously been a school subject, and anthropologists had paid little attention to the schools. Sponsored by their respective learned societies, headed by social scientists, and funded by the National Science Foundation, these two projects marked the entry of the social sciences in force with a new self-consciousness of their

curricular role. Events now moved rapidly. In the fall of 1962 the U.S. Office of Education announced "Project Social Studies," calling for proposals from educators, historians, and social scientists to improve research, instruction, teacher education, and the dissemination of information.

That reform ferment in the social studies extended far beyond the projects was shown by the publication in 1962 by the California State Department of Education of a "social studies framework" for curriculum revision consisting of generalizations from "the eight social sciences": geography, history, political science, economics, anthropology, psychology, sociology, and philosophy.[1]

The turmoil in the social studies was evident in the 42nd annual NCSS convention in November of 1962. "What we have is a multitude of pressures and proposals that are leading in many directions," one NCSS reporter wrote. "The social studies are in a crisis, and some sort of revolution is coming, but no one can yet say what is going to happen or even what should happen."[2]

Debate on New Directions for Social Studies

The assertion of the individual disciplines and the proposals to throw "the social studies" overboard represented one direction. Samuel P. McCutchen, then NCSS president and a veteran of the defunct Progressive Education Association, warned that the end result could be "a struggle of power politics in which the scholarly discipline with the loudest voice and the largest purse will capture the coveted years of the senior high school, pushing the weaker fields into the elementary grades."[3] The social studies failed to develop coherence largely because teachers had followed the 1916 NEA report pattern of separate content organization, he believed. Later they had attempted to squeeze in economics and sociology, usually using history but sometimes using geography as the vehicle for inclusion. The addition of new disciplines would only make matters worse, McCutchen warned.

McCutchen proposed that instead of endlessly proliferating the academic disciplines in the curriculum, each with its own purpose, the social studies should become a discipline in its own right with its own

integrity. Defining a discipline as "a pattern of values which imposes a pattern of behavior on its disciples," McCutchen argued that the distinctive task of the social studies was "to instruct the young into a self-perfecting, though tough, society," helping them to understand it and to move it closer to its ideals. This task, he declared, identified the four elements of the "discipline of the social studies": the societal goals of America, the heritage and values of Western civilization, the dimensions and interrelationships of today's world, and a specific process of rational inquiry and the tenets of good scholarship. The heart of the latter was the step-by-step problem-solving approach: sensing a problem, stating it specifically, considering plans for study and action, collecting and interpreting pertinent information, reaching a tentative conclusion, and taking action consistent with the decision reached. McCutchen did not consider these proposals revolutionary or even new. What he said he was attempting to do was to pull together various familiar elements, to propose a thesis for their synthesis, and to examine their relevance to the thesis. In effect, he presented a very old argument about the nature of the social studies, suitably refurbished to meet the present disciplinary challenge.

Further debate on "revising the social studies" appeared in the April 1963 issue of Social Education, a debate that showed how deeply Brunerian ideas, especially "structure," "inquiry," and "concepts," were influencing--or being used by--social studies educators. The meanings attached to these terms, however, were variously interpreted and sometimes contradictory. The discussion was opened by Shirley H. Engle, who argued for a "structure" for the social studies based on regularly "recurring emphasis on the basic ideas or concepts in terms of which all human experience is explained."[4] Engle proposed a list of nine bases: culture, man in culture interacting with nature, social groups, economic organization, political organization, freedom, interdependence, science, and the suprarational. The principal areas in which all societies have persistent problems, Engle believed, are integrally related to these concepts. Likewise, all the disciplines have something to contribute to each basic concept. The course of study should provide that every child "have the opportunity to study and understand the important problems which confront the American people," problems whose increasingly "more

informed and mature treatment" is "the single most important objective of the social studies."

Byron A. Massialas, basing his suggestion on Engle's "structure," described "the process by which ideas are developed, verified, and reconstructed," in which "inquiry models" of "search, verifiability, and invention" are used by the learner "in his quest to find dependable knowledge."[5] In addition to analytic inquiry, Massialas urged that "intuitive thinking" a la Bruner ("creative encounters") and conflicting value claims in our society should receive more attention. A school system so oriented would "provide educational leadership and act as a major reconstructing agent in society," Massialas concluded.

Lawrence E. Metcalf outlined current deficiencies in the social studies curriculum: the wholly ritualistic quality of instructional purposes, "poor and wrong" solutions to problems of student motivation, an erroneous conception of problem-solving, a failure to accord recognition to the newer social sciences, the continued domination of history, methods courses that elaborated on the obvious, and a tendency to treat normative aspects of instruction with the totalitarian methods of prescription and indoctrination.[6] Metcalf analyzed all of these deficiencies in relation to what he believed should be the major purpose of social studies--the fostering of reflective thought in the closed areas of American culture; that is, "those areas of belief and thought which are largely closed to rational thought." Teach valuing but not values, he urged. "A knowledge of the structure of the social sciences has a large role to play in all valuing," Metcalf asserted, "and there is no conflict between those who want to teach the basic content of a field, and a process of intelligent valuing."

The problem of scope and sequence was addressed by Paul R. Hanna, who pointed out that few current projects began with an overall design and that there were no scope and sequence proposals which had institutional or organizational support.[7] He urged that each "task force" (project) defer designing the particular component until the team had proposed a systems approach that clearly demonstrated the overall structure of social education into which its own content and processes could best fit. Hanna did not advocate a grand design for all schools; he pointed out that to start with the pieces and later rearrange them did

not offer much promise of improved school programs and would condemn the "piecemeal, separate-discipline projects to ultimate mismatch and probable failure."

Hanna's own design for the elementary schools was a holistic and coordinated approach to the study of man living in societies, built around the theme of sequentially expanding communities, from the family community in grade 1 to the U.S. national community in grade 7, each organized around such major themes as communicating, educating, organizing, and governing. Following this, Hanna suggested further sequences covering the United States and the inter-American community, the Atlantic community, the Pacific community, and the world community. Building on this holistic approach for the elementary school, the secondary school curriculum, Hanna believed, could consist of separate disciplines: first a year of world geography, then a year of world history, then required semesters of economics and political institutions and processes, emphasizing theory and practice in the United States within a world setting. American history was almost universally required in the junior year, Hanna stated, although whether this was a statement of fact, a problem to be dealt with, or a curricular recommendation is not clear. The climax would be a "Problems of Society" course in which great issues were studied and optimal solutions examined, calling on all the disciplines. This proposal would require the teamwork of professional teachers and scholars from the social sciences and history, Hanna believed. Although Hanna's sequence is not entirely clear to this reader as it pertains to the secondary grades, he obviously advocated fairly extensive changes. Hanna was one of the very few educators in this period even to attempt a specific scope and sequence not tied to specific materials.

The final article was written by a historian, Thomas C. Mendenhall, president of Smith College and the only contributor to the discussion who was not based in a school of education.[8] Mendenhall argued that the failure of the academic leaders of the social sciences to join hands with social studies teachers had delayed attention to a rethinking of the social studies curriculum comparable to that which had occurred in other school subjects. The problems, however, were formidable: in volume (the addition of non-Western cultures and world history), in

method (new techniques in the behavioral sciences), and in purpose (students would all too soon become "workers or soldiers"). Moreover, students were probably taking less history and social studies in relation to other school subjects than had been the case 25 years earlier. Mendenhall believed that the questions which lay ahead were equally formidable: what was to be the scope and sequence; when areas in history and concepts in social science should be introduced; whether history and social science could be more effectively and harmoniously combined in the future than they had been in the past. Mendenhall appeared to believe that some combination of history and anthropology offered the most promise because of the closeness of social anthropology and social history. Yet even here there were substantial difficulties to be overcome. Mendenhall assumed that too precipitate an introduction of an anthropological framework, as outlined by Engle, "might be catastrophic." He urged as a first step the broadening of preservice and inservice training to involve more social science. What Mendenhall evidently had in mind was a slow infusion of social science concepts into the curriculum, along with some alliance between history and anthropology.

The venerable 1916 NEA report curriculum had little support from these leaders of social studies reform. They were most united at a high level of generalization on "inquiry," but each interpreted the term differently. They welcomed the social sciences with varying degrees of enthusiasm, but all tried to incorporate them. The individual disciplines, as opposed to some other form of curricular organization (for example, one based on "concepts"), engaged their attention. History was downplayed as one among many components of the social studies or included in the condemnation of the individual-disciplines approach. The traditional citizenship component of the social studies continued, but in a much vaguer or more generalized form. Most reformers showed little interest in its embodiment in specific courses in civics/civil government or "Problems of Democracy," which only a few years previously had seemed so vital a professional concern.

Project Social Studies--and Others

Into this rather fluid and problematic situation moved the new projects supported by Project Social Studies, adding a new series of power centers to those already established by the NSF-supported projects. By the end of 1963, the U.S. Office of Education had contracted to set up seven new curriculum centers at universities under arrangements that assured them three to five years of support. Most projects at the centers were focused on the social studies and one or more of the individual disciplines, the major exception being the Harvard project on analysis of public issues. By 1965, 12 Project Social Studies Centers were in existence. In addition to those named earlier, there was one on 12th-grade economics, directed by John G. Sperling and Suzanne E. Wiggins; one in U.S. history (the Amherst Project); one in Asian cultures, directed by John U. Michaelis; and one on basic social science for college undergraduates planning to become natural scientists or engineers. The NSF added to its sponsored projects the High School Geography Project and MACOS (Man: A Course of Study). But these by no means completed the list of social studies projects. The Greater Cleveland Social Science Program, the Senesh project (Our Working World) and several others in economics, the activities of the Lincoln Filene Center for Citizenship and Public Affairs at Tufts University, the world history project directed by L.S. Stavrianos at Northwestern University, the Glen Falls project in world affairs sponsored by NCSS, and a number of others were thriving. In addition, the project developers now had an organization of their own, the Social Science Education Consortium, directed by an economist, Irving Morrissett. As the 1916 report had brought NCSS into being, so the new movement developed an organization for its own purposes.

It was not until 1965 that the 1960s reform movement got a name--the "new social studies"--in an article by Edwin Fenton and John M. Good in the April 1965 issue of Social Education discussing Project Social Studies.[9] Like the term "social studies" itself, the name came after rather than before the fact. Fenton and Good identified the major characteristics of all or most of the projects as follows: identification of the structure of the individual disciplines and/or basic social

science concepts, discovery or inductive teaching and learning, use of the modes of inquiry of historians and social scientists, an attempt to build in cumulative, sequential learning, the notion that any idea can be taught successfully in some form to any child at any age, the challenge to the older subjects (history, geography and civics) by the social sciences, the proliferation of an explosive variety of new audio-visual materials, and teacher involvement, largely through field testing in experimental classes.

Fenton and Good were describing the characteristics of the USOE projects, not the reform movement as a whole. But their description seems to fit most of the projects, whether national or local. Further characteristics shared by some projects were "post-holing" (focusing on one topic or situation "in depth"), concern with area studies, and some scope and sequence development cast in terms of specific materials rather than general topics or subjects suggested systematically for each grade. What were clearly omitted in most projects were "citizenship education" as the overriding purpose of social studies education, "affective" learning, social problems, the slow and often the "average" student, and a systematic examination of the relationship of the social science disciplines to each other or an exploration of how they might be combined or integrated for purposes of instruction.

The newly named "new social studies" projects continued to proliferate after 1965. By 1967 there were more than 50 national curriculum development projects.[10] Materials, however, were slow to appear. The careful design, testing, and retesting procedures and the team format used by most project developers virtually precluded rapid materials production for mass distribution. It was not until 1967 that new social studies materials began to be issued in significant amounts.[11]

The "New Social Studies" in Local Curriculum Guides

Meanwhile, many local school systems were busily revising their elementary and secondary curricula in light of the "new social studies" ideology. A 1967 survey of 42 recent curriculum guides revealed what new social studies emphases seem to have been picked up by the schools, if not in the classroom.[12] According to Dorothy M. Fraser of Hunter

College, who reviewed the guides with the help of an NCSS committee, the following trends were discernible in both elementary and secondary guides: (1) attempts to identify a conceptual structure and to implement "concepts" and "generalizations" (the distinctions between them were often unclear, and they were often poorly integrated with content), (2) more-adequate study of peoples and cultures of the world beyond the United States and Western Europe, (3) rapid introduction of materials from the behavioral sciences (sociology and anthropology), of economic concepts, and of "hitherto neglected aspects of political science," (4) deeper study of a few topics, (5) growth of a comparative approach, (6) emphasis on "inquiry" and "discovery" (more often recommended than spelled out), and (7) use of multimedia materials. In the primary grades more depth of content was noted; some topics or "skills" were being moved from the intermediate to the primary grades, and there were various plans to rearrange U.S. history, geography, and civics so as to avoid "the repetitive survey nature of the traditional three cycles of American history." Nowhere in the Fraser review is there specific reference to students behaving as social scientists, although this may have been omitted in the summaries. A few of the guides (Chicago; Gary, Indiana) gave specific attention to Negro history. One developed a "block-time" approach (social studies and the language arts), another a correlation between American history and literature.

Of the 42 guides reviewed, 3 were for K-12, 13 primarily for the elementary grades, and 26 for junior or senior high school, mostly the latter. Among the secondary guides, there were seven separate guides for U.S. history or civilization courses, two for world history, one each for world geography and modern European history, five for government or civics, and one each for anthropology, sociology, and psychology. The majority of the guides were developed by suburban districts or smaller towns, but a substantial minority were produced by large or medium-size cities. The attention to the elementary and high school grades (especially the latter), along with the relative lack of attention to the junior high, is suggestive. The tendency in the elementary schools was to revise all or several grades, in the secondary school to revise by course or grade levels rather than to undertake more-comprehensive revision.

While it is dangerous to generalize from so small a sample, the "new social studies" characteristics revealed in the guides probably give a reasonably good indication of the actual impact of the movement on curriculum-makers in the schools, if not in the classroom itself. If the "new social studies" appeared full-blown in the projects and in the pages of Social Education in the mid to late 1960s, in the school curricula during this period they assumed a somewhat different and more modest guise, definitely influential but certainly not all-pervasive. The curriculum guides furnish a kind of rock-bottom or minimalist definition of the "new social studies." Later attempts to trace the impact of the "new social studies" movement on the schools have generally overlooked the significance of the early and selective incorporation of "new social studies" principles into the guides in the absence of actual materials. For teachers who read or used them (and any seasoned observer of the schools knows that there is a gap between guides and classrooms), it is quite possible that the guides rather than the project materials represented the "new social studies." Because the reform literature contained major "new social studies" ideas but few specific examples of the project materials that were to exemplify them, school districts or state education departments seeking to apply these new ideas had to invent their own applications. For a movement so firmly based on materials development, this was a decided disadvantage. Nevertheless, the local applications might have paved the way to a much wider use of project materials had not the locus of reform shifted so decisively at the end of the 1960s.

Critiques of the "New Social Studies"

To translate "new social studies" principles into curriculum realities was a formidable task, even for the projects. Many were the challenges and perils along the way, many of which involved the nature of the disciplines and their relationships to each other. The "new social studies" made a heroic effort to distill the essence of each discipline and to differentiate the disciplines from one another. The resulting definitions were often simply snapshots of the current states of the disciplines, with little sense of their historical development and with

little consideration of how they might currently be perceived by teachers. The characteristics of the disciplines, as presented by the "new social studies" reformers, often had a static quality, as if they had never changed in the past and would not in the future. This effort at definition, of course, was part of the attempt to inject the latest disciplinary thinking into the classroom. As to the relationships of the disciplines to each other, the many references to "interdisciplinary" or "multidisciplinary" approaches did little to elucidate how the disciplines might be integrated or combined for purposes of instruction. The many previous attempts to do so were evidently unknown to most "new social studies" advocates.

Another problem was that some of the key terms of the "new social studies"--for example, "structure," "inquiry," and "concept"--remained open to various interpretations. "Structure" was a notion easier to apply to the social sciences, certainly in their new presentation, than to the old stand-bys, history and civics. There was simply no agreement among historians that history had a "structure." Civics, the only social studies subject specifically invented for school instruction, had no discernible structure. "Inquiry" looked like a combination of "problem-solving" and "critical thinking," which was probably not quite what many "new social studies" proponents had in mind, but which meant the term could be readily used or at least talked about. The meaning of "concept" was fuzzy in spite of efforts to differentiate "concepts," "subconcepts," "generalizations," and so forth. Since the curriculum was supposed to be organized around "concepts," this lack of clarity was a serious matter, not to mention the fact that nothing inherent in "concepts" prevented them from simply being memorized, which no one favored.

Yet another problem was the fact that the schools had to deal with scope and sequence, whether or not this was a concern of social studies reformers. The old "1916 curriculum" had few supporters among reformers within or outside the "new social studies," and even fewer offered generally applicable alternatives, again leaving the schools with the problem. As for citizenship education, once considered the overriding purpose of social studies, this was downplayed, ignored, assumed to be an automatic outcome, or viewed as a specialization linked to political

science. Methods of teaching constituted another problem. The "new" teaching methods made heavy demands on the teacher. In reality, the new methods were not so different from those traditionally advocated by reformers--with historically uncertain and mixed results, if the decades-old complaints about didactic teaching were to be believed. The "traditional" classroom was declared outmoded, but the reasons for its persistence--or even the evidence of its persistence--were left unexamined. Finally, many of the projects seemed to be directed to able academic students, leaving the others in the lurch, the "slow students" particularly. The "whole child" was bifurcated into what was somewhat grandly called the "cognitive and affective domains," and the cognitive domain was the new social studies heartland.

Many of these problems were noted by critics inside and outside of the "new social studies." Following the 1965 Fenton/Good article on Project Social Studies, for example, a series of reactions was published in Social Education which, while often pointing to "new social studies" strengths, warned also of weaknesses.[13] Fred M. Newmann warned that "inductive teaching" could result in engineering students toward predetermined "discoveries," generalizations, and conclusions, thus deadening the development of intellectual autonomy in the student--or, conversely, that it could result in students' arriving at unanticipated generalizations not part of the desired structure.

Byron A. Massialas criticized the neglect of "normative and affective components of the curriculum" and the lack of contact between empirical generalizations from the social sciences and value judgments expressed by individuals about society. Sources of curriculum other than "the structures of their disciplines"--such as the individual and society--were omitted. Massialas also criticized several projects for lacking real concern with instructional strategies and simply assuming that what was good for the social scientist as researcher was also good for the child or adolescent.

According to Richard E. Gross, the projects suffered from failure to delineate purposes: we are uncertain about which knowledge is of most worth and why, he wrote. Gross charged that hazy and somewhat unsophisticated research designs--some neglecting really important problems, others focusing on narrow topics, and others encompassing far too

much--yielded a "veritable hodge-podge of unrelated studies." Gross also questioned project staffing and evaluation procedures, duplication of effort (especially in identifying basic social science generalizations), a tendency to concentrate on the average and above-average student, and development of "teacher-proof materials" which could reduce the teacher to a mere technician.

William H. Cartwright wrote that he had the impression that the projects assumed that practically all of the old in social studies education was bad. He asked how we could prevent adoption of the worst in the new, in the face of pressures to be up to date and the influence of financial subsidies. Further, he asked, how can we keep the best of what we now have? Are any of the projects working to help teachers become increasingly competent? Cartwright queried.

A commentator from a school district, Carl O. Olsen, Jr., envisioned a coming "articulation nightmare": more materials were needed for conventional courses and for assisting teachers in methods of teaching, he observed, and teachers needed to be reeducated in the social sciences. "Significant revolutions must occur on a K-12 basis," Olsen warned, and more public school teachers must be involved. He feared that large-scale curriculum building might threaten local curriculum building and the integrity of the teacher.

These and similar critiques were more fully developed during the next few years. Not all of those who offered critiques of one aspect of the "new social studies" necessarily did so from the same basic perspective. Some defenders of history, for example, embraced "structure"; others eschewed it. Some proponents of "concepts" located them within the social science disciplines; others rejected the disciplines themselves. Some called for attention to public issues and social needs while ignoring or attacking the disciplines; others saw the disciplines as essential to their consideration. It was indeed a "climate of experimentation" that prevailed in the reform literature.

Nevertheless, emerging from the exuberant and diverse reform literature were seven basic themes: One was the greatly increased role of the social sciences and a corresponding decrease in history, usually accompanied by some commitment to area studies. Another was an intense focus on concepts and generalizations. A third was a concentration on

methodology and processes, including "inquiry" and the formulation of objectives. A fourth was some version of "post-holing" or "case studies." A fifth was the need to incorporate new knowledge or new methodologies in the curriculum. A sixth was some attention to "values." A seventh was a rejection of the 1916 NEA curriculum. Those who disagreed fundamentally over the role of the disciplines or the meaning of "structure" or "cognitive" versus "affective" learning generally supported, exemplified, or used these seven basic themes. It was a strange and in some ways fragile consensus, of which the parties to the dispute were certainly not fully aware. The consensus was nevertheless significant, not the least because its components could be transferred to the new period of social studies reform which would shortly arise in response to a new set of societal issues.

Lessons From the "New Social Studies"

By 1967 the "new social studies" dominated social studies reform and had set the reform agenda. Those who criticized from either the inside or the outside did so with an explicit or tacit recognition that this was the case. The impressive number of projects (which peaked in 1967), the overwhelming attention to the "new social studies" in Social Education and other journals, and the profusion of programs at professional meetings demonstrated how central a place the "new social studies" had won in the upper reaches of reform. The intellectual capital amassed over a decade, however, had been virtually spent. The movement was no longer creating "new" ideas but was instead working out the implications of those already widely accepted. Substantial curriculum revisions had been made in some local and state school systems, among them those of New York and California, even in the absence of project materials. This process inevitably involved modifying but not displacing the old curriculum. It is difficult to estimate how much the "new social studies," even in diluted form, actually affected the classroom--a familiar problem common to all reform movements. But there is considerable evidence that many teachers, including men and women who had no more than passing acquaintance with national reform, were experimenting with "concepts," the infusion of social sciences, some version of "inquiry," multimedia materials, and other elements of the movement.

The basic assumption of the "new social studies" was that the "revolution" would be accomplished through the introduction of new carefully designed and tested materials for teaching and learning. Before 1967, only a scattering of materials from the projects had been published. In the late 1960s these began to appear in small numbers with the publication of some materials from the Anthropology Curriculum Study Project, the Harvard Project, and the Fenton/Good project at Carnegie-Mellon. By 1972 a substantial number of "new social studies" project materials were on the market. The developers envisioned an exciting but orderly process of change and adaptation. In some fashion a new and more satisfying curriculum structure would emerge in which the "new social studies" would have commanding influence, the project materials would be duly ensconced in the classroom, and the revolution would be accomplished. The "new social studies" proponents entertained their own revolution of rising expectations in spite of warnings by people like James M. Becker, who in 1965 had pointed out that "educational change does take place, but . . . seldom moves far ahead of public attitudes" and that "teacher competence and availability of materials are further inhibitory factors."[14]

Why, in the late 1960s, were the leaders of the "new social studies" so unaware of what was about to befall the movement?

The first reason is that they knew so little about the past. It is highly doubtful, for example, that more than a very few had heard of the Citizenship Education Project. The once famous "Brown Boxes," which only a decade earlier had represented the crown jewels of reform, now rested in school storerooms if they survived at all. It is understandable that, since most of the developers had had little previous experience with the schools, they would be unaware of the social studies past. They did not, however, see that deficiency as a problem. They believed that they could create the future with only passing reference to the past.

Second, the "new social studies" projects, despite the fact that they were manned by social scientists, neglected or entirely overlooked the social upheavals of the 1960s: the civil rights movement, the anti-war movement, the crises of the cities, the agony of the poor, blacks, and other "minorities," and the involvement of the young in social

activism and protest. However conscious the leaders were as individuals of the upheavals of the 1960s, as curriculum developers they seemed to dwell in the 1950s world from which the "new social studies" had arisen, not in the 1960s world in which their materials were being developed and would be launched. Yet it was the world of the 1960s that was in the blood and bone of the young teachers who were expected to be standard bearers of the "new social studies."

Third, most of the project developers had had only a highly selective exposure to the diversity and problems of the real world of the schools. Their contacts were mostly limited to those schools that agreed to test their materials. Since the developers tended to assume that everything that had gone before had little real or current value (a position shared by some of their critics), they did not seek to find out what the schools were already doing well or what the conditions or limits of change might be. Nor did they seem to develop much conception of what it was like to be a classroom teacher. Many but not all of the projects regarded the teacher primarily as a recipient and implementor of new materials; rarely was the teacher perceived as a creative force in the classroom or as someone from whom they might learn anything beyond reactions to the materials they were testing. Many of the projects provided such detailed specifications that the teacher had little room to adapt or choose. As for students, the enormous diversity of the student population largely escaped the developers, the "slower" students being practically invisible. Their initial model of the student as scholarly inquirer was not altered to portray more realistically the variety of students in the schools or even to reshape the developers' image of the academic student.

Fourth, materials development was an exacting and exciting task, one which demanded considerable focused commitment. Deadlines had to be met; reports had to be made. Simply managing a "team" was time- and energy-consuming. Already possessing a powerful ideology and experiencing the pressures as well as the delights of the multiple tasks at hand, the project developers had little time or energy to stand back or to reflect more broadly.

Fifth, the very fact that vast amounts of money were poured into the projects seemed to constitute not only a recognition of their value but an assurance of their success.

Finally, the "new social studies" reformers seemed largely oblivious to the 1960s critiques of the schools which pictured them as heartless, joyless, stiffly academic, and unresponsive to the personal and "cultural" needs of students--as vast academic custodial institutions presided over by steely administrators and insensitive teachers, while the pulsing vitality of students was crushed and uniformity was relentlessly engineered. There were many varieties of this charge; one of the most powerful was directed to urban schools and particularly toward the situation of Negro children. For example, in 1967 Larry Cuban, in the pages of Social Education, attacked the compensatory programs for urban children as "educational tokenism."[16] "Unfortunately," he wrote, "moderation, both in civil rights and education, results in tokenism. . . . The schools have failed to educate," he charged, "and the responsibility for this failure rests with the nature and operation of the educational system." Educators don't know much about education; we don't know what a good teacher is; we don't know what methods, materials, or organization work best with children, Cuban declared. He advocated experimenting with "independent school models," decentralizing the school systems, giving the teachers a more central and creative role, and eliminating the neighborhood school. Although Cuban was not sanguine about the prospects for change nor even about the usefulness of his own suggestions, he was concerned that "something must be done."

The 1960s critiques, like those of the 1950s, presented a severe indictment of the schools. But while the 1950s had appealed to gradualism and reform in spite of talk of "revolution," the 1960s called for sweeping change, rejecting moderation as failure. What Cuban and other critics were calling for was a fundamental restructuring of the school system, not for tinkering with new curricular materials.

References

1. State Curriculum Commission, Social Studies Framework for the Public Schools of California (Sacramento: State Department of Education, 1962).

2. "What Happened in Philadelphia: Review of the 42nd Convention," Social Education 27 (February 1963), insert.

3. Samuel P. McCutchen, "A Discipline for the Social Studies," Social Education 27 (February 1963), pp. 61-65.

4. Shirley H. Engle, "Thoughts in Regard to Revision," Social Education 27 (April 1963), pp. 182-84, 196.

5. Byron A. Massialas, "Revising the Social Studies: An Inquiry-Centered Approach," Social Education 27 (April 1963), pp. 185-190.

6. Lawrence A. Metcalf, "Some Guidelines for Changing Social Studies Instruction," Social Education 27 (April 1963), pp. 197-201.

7. Paul R. Hanna, "Revising the Social Studies: What Is Needed?," Social Education 27 (April 1963), pp. 190-96.

8. Thomas C. Mendenhall, "Social Studies, History, and the Secondary School," Social Education 27 (April 1963), pp. 201-204.

9. Edwin Fenton and John M. Good, "Project Social Studies: A Progress Report," Social Education 26 (April 1962), pp. 206-208.

10. John D. Haas, The Era of the New Social Studies (Boulder, Colo.: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education and Social Science Education Consortium, 1977), p. 58. Haas considers 1967 the "zenith" of the movement.

11. Ibid., pp. 57-58.

12. Dorothy M. Fraser, ed., "Reviewing Curricular Materials," Social Education 31 (April 1967), pp. 307-312, 325-332.

13. "Reactions to the Reports on Project Social Studies," Social Education 29 (October 1965), pp. 356-360.

14. James M. Becker, "Prospects for Change in the Social Studies," Social Education 29 (January 1965), pp. 20-22, 31.

15. Larry Cuban, "Urban Schools and the Negro," Social Education 31 (October 1967), pp. 478-482.

7. A NEW MOVEMENT: RELEVANCE, ACTIVISM, AND IDENTITY

1968--a Turning Point

The events of 1968 projected the 1960s critique, or some versions thereof, into the consciousness of social studies educators. A series of social crises shook the nation and the nation's schools, initiating a period of passionate social activism and militancy. The murder of the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., was followed by riots in scores of American cities. The student strike at Columbia University soon spread to other campuses and then to high schools. At the national Democratic convention in Chicago, anti-war demonstrators confronted the police, with disastrous results. Rising militancy found organizational expression with the formation of groups calling for power--black, red, brown, and student power--all led by the young, often by college students or dropouts. It was hardly a propitious moment for the introduction of the "new social studies" materials into the schools, especially since they had so little to say about the very problems that gripped the nation and the nation's youth. At such a time, the structure of the disciplines, the student as academic scholar, and the delights of discovery and inquiry were tame stuff indeed, requiring a commitment to rational inquiry that many students specifically rejected.

The events of 1968 did not, of course, affect all schools and colleges equally or immediately. Nevertheless, their impact was profound in creating an atmosphere of intense involvement in the present and its passions and in calling for massive social change. Never before, even during times of war, had so many educational institutions involving so many students been so directly and quickly affected as they were in the

late 1960s and early 1970s. While the causes of the upheavals in society went far beyond the schools, students developed a new self-consciousness and tested their new-found power, sometimes by confrontations, sometimes more circumspectly. Within the country there seemed to be another country of the young, with its own concerns, its own voices, its own music, its own rituals.

The "new social studies" image of the student had arisen, not primarily from what students were doing or saying, but from what the leaders of the movement conceived as the appropriate student role. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, students themselves were taking a hand in defining that role. To many future teachers, the "new social studies" conception of the student was both ridiculous and intolerable. It belied the blood and bone of their own passionate experience--the teach-ins, the crusade against the Vietnam war, the challenge to adult authority. When history spoke to the present and to them, its voice came from the New Left, whose powerful ideology helped students to unite and to view their struggles as part of a worldwide movement of profound significance. While the student revolt was probably not so widespread nor so deep as it seemed at the time, it was sufficiently influential to elicit significant, if often temporary, changes in the colleges and in the schools.

Teachers, who in the "new social studies" conception had been largely implementors of materials, were asserting a more active role. Some reacted defensively to the assertion of student "power." Others, seeking to steer student discontent into more "constructive" channels, adjusted their curricula and teaching to the new demands or joined hands with students. Many of the young teachers had been participants in rebellions when they were students, and they sought new ways of "relating" this past to the role of teacher.

The social studies response to the turmoil in the schools and in society did not take the form of a well-developed ideology. Rather, the catchword was "relevance"--to social problems and to "self-realization." The student as academic inquirer was replaced by the student as social activist in search of an individual or group identity.

Black History

The pages of Social Education quickly filled with articles on social problems. One of the first responses was the extensive attention to what was called "the black experience." A 1968 article by James A. Banks declared, "Inquiries into black power, poverty, racism, the black revolt, and historical reactions to oppression should characterize social studies for black pupils." He predicted: "A 'New Negro' is in the making, one who is trying to reject his old identity, shaped to a large extent by white society, and to create a new one." Banks called on social studies teachers "to promote this identity quest" by encouraging black students to inquire into racism past and present, by stressing contributions of black people, and by developing more-positive attitudes in and higher expectations for black youth. Only thus, Banks believed, could the urban racial crises be mitigated and the black child gain a more positive "self." Banks's examples of good classroom practices used analyses of historical documents, "inquiry," and other new social studies procedures.[1]

The entire April 1969 issue of Social Education was exclusively devoted to "black Americans and social studies" and "minority groups in American society." Nathan Hare advocated courses in black history and culture that "must be, above all, the story of the struggle and aspirations of the black race; not merely a cataloging of the white race's undernourished if not infected conception of the black race and its goals--a view endorsed in one way or another by black assimilationists as well as the white majority."[2] Hare suggested the establishment of major black holidays which would parallel what St. Patrick's Day was "for the Irish, though celebrated by others." His proposed Black History Week, corresponding to Yom Kippur, could begin with the date of Malcolm X's assassination (February 21), ignore February 22, "the birthday of George Washington (a slavemaster and the president of a slaveholding nation)," and continue with February 23, the birthday of W.E.B. DuBois.

Emily Gibson asserted that "so-called historians have distorted the image of black people, deleted from their writings the contributions of Negroes who did not conform to the prevailing stereotype, and have

thereby denied black people the right to pride in their heritage."[3] The work of Samuel Eliot Morrison was cited as an example. After describing a number of neglected aspects of black history, such as slave revolts and black African empires, black contributions to American life, and examples of "the white man's inhumanity to other human beings" which "exposed American history as it really is," she depicted black youth as "'hip' to the uncollected funds from a check written in 1863, and to 'jive' terms like that 'cat' they are told to revere as the Great Emancipator, . . . 'hip' to Dr. King but 'turned off' to nonviolence because they've never seen it work," and "putting down Uncle Tom and Mr. Charlie and everything respected by the 'Establishment'." She reported that black youth were "demanding that school curriculums and textbooks be revised to 'tell it like it is,'" and that administrators and school boards were discovering that "they have no alternative but to capitulate to the first demands of the 'Now!' Generation."

Two other contributors attacked the black biography approach as insufficient. Edwin Fenton asserted that knowledge of the achievement of black individuals would not do much by itself to change black or white attitudes, and that the biographical approach might well inhibit learning the inquiry skills needed to solve problems, since problem-solving requires a much greater range of materials.[4] Black and white students would react against filiopietism, he warned. Some "black heroes" now in textbooks have had a much less significant impact on history than hundreds of whites whose exploits are ignored, and perceptive white and black students will find this out, Fenton believed. He urged a more significant treatment of black history, emphasizing total impact rather than individual contributors. The education of blacks and of whites should help students to develop "positive self-concepts, constructive attitudes to learning, coherent value systems, essential learning skills, and sophisticated inquiry techniques."

The historian Louis R. Harlan, biographer of Booker T. Washington, warned that while black cultural nationalism and separatism was no worse than other nationalisms, historians had seen far too much of the pathology of nationalism in the 20th century to encourage new ones.[5] He considered the black version of "cherry tree history" as misleading and unrealistic, and believed that the depiction of American black leaders

of the past as race betrayers to be banished from history revealed an ill-informed understanding of the American Negro past. Harlan proposed instead five major interpretative themes: (1) historical repression and subordination of blacks and other nonwhites, (2) the fact that black Americans unlike white Americans "do not have a progressive history," but have gone from one bad situation to another, (3) the cyclical nature of Negro history in terms of recurring patterns in the actions of both blacks and whites, (4) Negro cultural history, and (5) black urbanization.

Other contributors urged teachers to recognize Negro nonstandard dialect as a legitimate language system, to beware of "an egalitarian doctrine that confuses equality with sameness," and to recognize that American society is pluralistic.[6] That issue of Social Education also included articles on American Indians, "The U.S. Hispano," and "The Orientals," emphasizing the role of ethnic identity and its importance to the child.

Most of the new reform literature on teaching black history or on other "minority" groups (women were shortly included) was approached primarily from the viewpoint (sometimes viewpoints) of the group in question, or at least from what the author believed it to be. There was little critical discussion of what might be the more general impact on the schools of the proliferation of the history of ethnic groups.

One source of confusion, Hazel W. Hertzberg pointed out in 1972, resulted from the shifting definitions of "ethnic," "minority," and "pluralism."[7] Not so long ago, "pluralism" had meant affirming mutual respect among religious communities, while Negroes and some other groups were considered "minorities." Today, she wrote, "minorities" are almost exclusively nonwhite, while "ethnics," once classified as "minorities," were now frequently criticized as resenting "minorities." Women, not considered ethnics, were often designated as a "minority." In this shifting focus of pluralism, Hertzberg believed, what was reasonably constant was the identification of those within its range as having been unfairly dealt with, ignored, or misunderstood, and therefore requiring compensatory treatment. While a critique of past curriculum treatment of the group may well be sound, she averred, the tendency to overcompensate is not and raises serious problems, which she described as follows:

--It is widely but erroneously assumed that because groups have been discriminated against, they are free from prejudice, an assumption that leaves a considerable portion of American history incomprehensible and leaves students unprepared to deal with group antagonisms.

--Ethnic groups are often portrayed as much more monolithic than they actually are, an approach that not only is unfair to their diversity but also helps to reinforce the dominance of one element, treating deviates as somehow heretical.

--Ethnic groups are presented as virtually time-free, unchanging entities, which they are not, some being of fairly recent invention. Acculturation, which has taken place in a major way in every ethnic group, is often treated as inherently unnatural or demeaning, thus removing it from consideration as an historical development.

--It is often assumed that an individual must belong to an ethnic group. This view ignores the enormous mixing that has taken place, making it difficult for people to choose identification with one group even if they want to, exacerbating the insecurities of marginal individuals who may be most vociferously hostile to outsiders, and ignoring the conformity that an ethnic group may exact from its members.

"The price societies pay for warring ethnicities can be staggeringly high," Hertzberg warned. "The young are particularly vulnerable to these boiling hatreds and in many cases have played an active role in giving vent to them. As educators we should give serious thought to the possible consequences for our own society of a primary commitment to ethnicity without a sufficiently strong commitment to national goals and ideals which can unite us. This is probably the most fateful question we will face in the coming decade." Throughout most of the 1970s, ethnicity and minorities continued as a major theme in Social Education, with rejection of the melting pot and commitment to cultural pluralism treated as articles of faith rather than as positions to be examined.

Renewal of Citizenship Education

Another emphasis in the period following 1968 was on a refurbished version of citizenship education. This theme had by no means dropped out of Social Education during the 1960s, when it constituted one of the

major areas of disagreement between social science disciplinarians and the social studies advocates who favored a subsidiary role for the disciplines. One aspect of citizenship education was education about the law, and Social Education in the 1960s had carried a number of inserts devoted to law and court cases.

In 1969 John J. Patrick called for the reform of civic education, essentially along "new social studies lines."[8] He drew heavily on the literature of political socialization, which suggested that current civic education programs had little or no impact on the political attitudes, values, and beliefs of high school students. The exception was Negro students. Patrick reported that the studies attributed this circumstance to these students' relative lack of previous information. Patrick also pointed to alienation, authoritarianism, and the lack of political "efficacy" among lower-class students. There was altogether too much emphasis upon conformity and a marked disparity between political realities and the content of civic education, he believed. If these unfortunate conditions were to be changed, a new type of civic education was needed.

Patrick's remedy was the reorganization of civic education around "key concepts from the behavioral and social sciences," using "pedagogical strategies" that engaged students actively in the quest for knowledge. Courses should be brought into line with current social studies scholarship, replacing "the traditional legalistic-historical-structural framework" that he believed had failed and that presumably had little new knowledge or few "key concepts" to offer.

Courses in political behavior, Patrick argued, were more than masses of neutral facts. Rather, they were "a determiner of the learner's thought processes and attitude structure." In Patrick's view, thought processes should be imbued with the norms of our culture concerning the validation of meaning--that is, "the scientific disposition" or "the scientific ethic." This type of learning would wash away some student values based on "folk wisdom." The attitude structure that Patrick hoped for was "cosmopolitan" in nature, involving greater political tolerance and sophistication and more political activity and efficacy. The social sciences, he believed, were creating a world in which national loyalty and the national state could no longer be taken for

granted. (Patrick did not examine further whether this "desacrilization" itself bespoke a value structure, as Beard had done in the early 1930s.) Through studying the social sciences, Patrick argued, students could interpret "politically relevant experiences" more powerfully and more adequately cope with political affairs. This "hope," he believed, was consistent with an "ideal" of our society; namely, an informed and "politically efficacious" citizenry as "an essential condition of a democracy."

In 1972, Social Education devoted an entire issue to teaching about American government which included a 1971 APSA survey of the attitudes of high school seniors (white, middle-class, and college-bound) toward their civics and government courses, as revealed by their agreement or disagreement with the statements in a questionnaire.[9] The students' concerns turned out to be "cosmopolitan," defined as an interest in national or international topics rather than state or local ones--an interest the author identified as a continuation of a pattern identified in 1967 by the political scientist M. Kent Jennings. Some version of cosmopolitanism seemed to be emerging, in spite of (or because of?) the schools. Students believed that the primary source of their information and ideas about the world or U.S. politics came from newspapers, magazines, and television, with only around 14 percent responding that they got their ideas from "teachers and schools."

The political issue that attracted the most interest (90%) was "war and peace"--not surprising during that Vietnam period. "Congress" was next on the list of interests, closely followed by race relations, courts and law, poverty, student protest, international politics, the presidency, pollution, state and local governments, elections and political parties, and the local community, all named by more than half the respondents. About half expressed substantial interest in European and Asian politics, less than a third in Latin American politics.

Civics and government courses were deficient in "new" knowledge, or so students believed. They got the most "new" knowledge from science courses (77%), and the least from U.S. history (16%), and 27 percent believed they got "new knowledge" from civics and government courses. Considering students' reliance on the mass media for information about politics and the relative lack of mass-media attention to science, this

finding was hardly surprising. The article somewhat airily asserted that students already possessed, or could easily acquire, general facts and information about political matters and that the classroom focus should be on fundamental concepts and skills.

The APSA survey further revealed that about half the students believed that they would most effectively learn to exercise "freedom of choice" by defending real choices they made about politics with fellow students, a much-more-favored course than discussing in class how they would make choices in different situations, making choices about what to study, defending fictional choices, or reading in books about the choices made by political leaders. Close to a majority (45%) favored participation in political activity within the school and evaluating the consequences in class discussion groups as the way they could best learn "to act with responsibility in political situations." Almost a quarter of the students (22%) reported that they had participated in "real" political and/or community activities as part of a civics or government course, and they believed overwhelmingly that such courses were much better than other social studies courses. This venerable approach (referred to by the author as "one of the most exciting but largely unappreciated approaches in civic education") was thus apparently alive and well in a substantial minority of classrooms in spite of its neglect by reformers in the 1960s.

The high school government course was in a state of flux, according to Judith A. Gillespie and Howard D. Mehlinger.[10] The "virtual monopoly" once held by "the legal/historical approach" had been broken, they declared. The authors saw two major choices: "political action alternatives" and "political inquiry alternatives"; the first in the community, the second in the classroom. They advocated linking the two by using the school as a "laboratory." The school itself offered opportunities for a case-study approach, for skill-building activities both conceptual and methodological, and as a training ground in effective political participation, they said. The authors appeared to believe that they were putting forward a new idea, when, in fact, such an approach had been tried repeatedly over several generations in many schools and with considerable sophistication, and had even succeeded in doing so without throwing overboard the dreaded "legal/historical

approach." The authors repeated, almost verbatim, claims of earlier reformers as to the desirable effects on schools, students, and teachers which they hoped would ensue. The authors, the director and a staff member of the Social Studies Development Center at Indiana University (which was dedicated to "the invention, development, and diffusion of new products and practices intended to improve social studies instruction"), proceeded in invincible ignorance of past products and practices, many of which did not have to be "invented" but only discovered, and most of which were much better developed than what was currently available. A knowledge of this rich past would have offered some suggestive clues to possible pitfalls or problems. At minimum, such knowledge would have meant starting at a considerably more advanced stage equipped with a fuller, if occasionally chastening, understanding of the efforts of their predecessors. As did black, minority, and ethnic studies, various versions of citizenship education efforts continued throughout the 1970s.

Other Problems and Methods

Along with minorities and citizenship, a third major emphasis during this period was on a series of social problems or "crises" that reflected proliferating reform sensibilities. In a sense, these were a social studies equivalent of the "special-interest politics" whose growth became so marked in the 1970s. These social issues included urbanization, environmentalism, population, futurism, women's studies, and area studies (especially of Africa and Asia). Little attention was directed to how the social studies curriculum as a whole might be affected by their inclusion. Most discussions of them employed "new social studies" terminology, especially "concepts" and "inquiry."

A fourth emphasis, primarily methodological or procedural, was focused on behavioral objectives, games and simulations, individualized instruction, decision making, and student and teacher choices. Values education, which tended to be treated procedurally, was emerging as an emphasis detached or semidetached from specific subjects or topics. All of these concerns had to some extent been included in the "new social studies" movement, and most had been familiar staples of social studies

reform for decades, although not necessarily with the same labels. Their popularity among social studies reformers in this period arose from diverse and sometimes conflicting sources. The increasing attention paid to behavioral objectives, for example, was in part a response to increasing demands for educational accountability. Games and simulations, individualized instruction, and decision making were addressed to individual student motivation and interest. The growing interest in student and teacher choices, which perhaps represented the most obvious break with the "new social studies," reflected altered views of student and teacher roles and the revolt against a set, formal, prescribed curriculum.

Values education was perhaps the most complex of these trends. Many social studies educators, when dealing with particular "crises" or social problems, had very specific values they wished to impart, values so deeply held or perhaps believed to be so much in need of attention that they were not open to examination by students. Only values flowing from or implied by the basic value position were thought to be suitable for student "choice." On the other hand, there was a good deal of attention to valuing exercises in which students identified and defended their own value positions. No values were assumed to be better than any other values--except the values inherent in the selection of "dilemmas" and values-clarification procedures, which students were not asked to examine. The popular values-clarification exercises of Sidney B. Simon were examples of this approach. While the stated intent was freedom from indoctrination, the exercises proposed were saturated with unexamined and implicit values. Simon himself left his readers in no doubt as to what values he favored and obviously hoped students would adopt. Many of the most popular values-clarification exercises looked suspiciously like indoctrination disguised as freedom of choice.[11]

By 1971 the "new social studies" and the newer social problems/self-realization approach had reached a somewhat uneasy detente. The "new social studies" projects were incorporating more social problems, while the latter approach often used the "new social studies" terminology and frequently referred to or drew on the social sciences. The common ground was found in objectives, concepts, inquiry, a concern with processes, valuing, and--of course--a tacit agreement to overlook scope and sequence.

The 1971 NCSS Guidelines

This accommodation was exemplified in the 1971 NCSS curriculum guidelines.[12] The twofold purpose of the social studies was to "enhance human dignity through learning and commitment to rational processes as principal means of attaining that end." Social problems were "the main concern of the social studies curriculum," whose curricular components were "knowledge," "abilities," "valuing," and "social participation." These, together with diversity, flexibility, and student involvement and choice, were emphasized in the checklist of more than 60 items by which curricula were to be evaluated.

The "structure of the disciplines" and the infusion of scholarly knowledge were welcome and necessary but not sufficient, the guidelines declared. Social issues were no respectors of academic boundaries. The disciplines "in their pure form" and content based on social science alone were not necessarily related to persistent social problems. Other sources of knowledge, including the humanities, the natural sciences, the communications media, and the interests and values of students ("a growing tip of culture") should be tapped, the document stated.

The guidelines thus plunged into several of the oldest of social studies debates: problems versus disciplines as the basis for the curriculum and the related issue of the combination or integration of the disciplines. If the social studies were to be primarily concerned with social problems, what specific role would the disciplines play? The "new social studies" had failed to pay much attention to social problems or to delineate a general approach to how the social sciences could be combined or integrated for purposes of instruction. On these matters, they had little to contribute. Neither did the proponents of the social problems/self-realization social studies. The latter reacted strongly against what they believed were "new social studies" deficiencies. Beyond this they offered mostly exhortations without suggesting how their proposals might be translated into curricular terms. It is doubtful whether they were even aware of the difficulties of the tasks they had set for the schools. Certainly they did not attempt to examine or elucidate those tasks.

Social problems were located in the "real social world" with which the school was urged to deal. "The real social world" was defined in

terms primarily cultural and social--"society," "culture," and to a lesser extent "community" being used throughout as entities to which students belonged. That they also belonged to a nation of which they were citizens and whose political processes might be involved in solving persistent social problems was a circumstance largely overlooked. "Nation" was obviously an embarrassing term to be studiously avoided. "National" was used only twice in the guidelines, in one place to differentiate between local, national, and world affairs and in another to urge the study of "policies which are commonly considered contrary to present national goals," such as slavery and imperialism. Labor was entirely omitted. "Ideas such as due process of law, social and economic justice, democratic decision-making, free speech, and religious freedom" were pointed out as aspects of "American culture" previously defining "human dignity," now extended beyond "political and economic connotations" to include "self-respect and group identity." That any of these "ideas" were actually embedded in the political (or social or cultural) institutions of the United States could not be inferred from the NCSS guidelines.

It is difficult to say what caused the atrophy of "the nation"--an excessive attachment to behavioral sciences; a reluctance to acknowledge students' obligations to a political community about which the authors had mixed feelings; a preoccupation with "group identity," defined in cultural, racial, and ethnic rather than national terms; or perhaps some combination of these and other factors.

The guidelines were specific about the "enduring or pervasive social issues" deemed "appropriate content for grades K-12": "economic injustice, conflict, racism, social disorder, and environmental imbalance," to which were elsewhere added "poverty, war, and population." The program should include "intensive and recurrent study of cultural, racial, religious, and ethnic groups, those to which students themselves belong and those to which they do not" and should offer opportunities for contact with "members of racial and ethnic groups other than their own." The social studies proposed "must contribute to the legitimacy of their [students'] own cultural group identity as well as the ways of others" and refrain from promoting "normative behavior characteristic primarily of white, middle-class society." The program should "build

upon the realities of the immediate school community" and should stress "participation in the real social world" within and outside of school.

The NCSS guidelines, in a stunning example of acute presentism, announced: "Intellectual skills, usually called thinking, have received widespread attention in the social studies only recently." Having thus disposed of their predecessors in the vineyards of reform, the guidelines added: "The school continues to be largely ineffective in this dimension." Although in the schools history remained the most common social studies subject, in the guidelines it was relegated to a list of the social sciences on which the curricula should draw and a few other brief mentions. "School history" was singled out as "often bland, merely narrative, repetitious, inattentive to the non-Western world; it is distorted by ignoring the experiences of Blacks, Chicanos, native American Indians, Puerto Ricans, and Oriental Americans." The guidelines did suggest that historical perspective "serves as a buffer against detachment and presentism" and "thereby enables an individual to establish a cultural identity." As to the other "traditional" subjects, civics/government and geography, teachers were warned against "badly out-of-date" ideas from political science and geography, and there were a few passing references to government. The other social sciences--of which two, economics and sociology, had been taught in the schools for decades--emerged unscathed. Evidently their school pasts warranted no warnings. "Useful ideas from anthropology, economics, social psychology, and psychology were ordinarily underrepresented in social studies programs," the document declared.

The curriculum should be built on "structural elements," the guidelines urged. These could be drawn from the social sciences, social issues, and social participation, but "structure must mean the students' own organization of their learning experience." (Here faint echoes of Dewey could be detected.) Schools should take a "fresh look at the conventional patterns of subjects and conventional courses offerings" and encourage mini-courses, independent study, alternate courses prepared by students, and other such devices to maximize flexibility and choice. At the same time, disorder and lack of direction should be avoided because they interfered with "the continuous reorganization of experience."

The use of the terms "structure" and "structural elements" in the guidelines provided an illusion of coherence without its substance. Nor was this surprising. Both the "new social studies" and the social problems/self-realization social studies rejected the old curriculum structure. Not only did they neglect to propose new structures, they did not examine the possible basis or elements of a new general scope and sequence. The nearest approximations to doing so were the particular scope-and-sequence recommendations built into a few of the "new social studies" projects which were tied to specifically tailored materials.

"Valuing" permeated the 1971 NCSS guidelines. "Mere indoctrination" was to be avoided as "ineffectual" and "incompatible with the principles of a free society." The guidelines thus joined the long list of documents that condemned indoctrination. However, mere condemnation did not dispose of the problem. "Still perplexing is the role of the school as an agent for inculcating in the young widely held societal norms, standards of behavior, and ideological preferences," the guidelines stated. "The issue is divided with conflicting attitudes held by various groups. Cultural pluralism in America rightly hinders the school from seeking or producing uniform values among its students. It is well to remember that the school is properly only one force influencing the values of the young," the guidelines declared.

In spite of these perplexities, the guidelines advocated several courses that could be taken by schools. Many differing legitimate values rooted in experience and culture could be reorganized, thus combating ethnocentrism. The school could help students freely examine value dilemmas underlying social issues and problematic situations. The school should also exemplify human dignity by practicing it: "Fair play and justice, free speech, opportunity for decision making, acceptance of the life styles of the community, group identity, [and] the right to privacy," plus the denial of racism, should characterize the school. In many schools this would require drastic changes, the report stated. The document averred that a frank recognition that neither the school nor the social studies could be value-free would help foster a serious consideration of what the school's role should be. In spite of the emphasis placed on "valuing," no questions specifically on valuing <u>per se</u> (as distinct from value-laden items) were included in the itemized checklist

except in one instance where valuing was included with knowledge, abilities, and participation as a part of progress assessment. Evidently the authors of the guidelines had their own value dilemmas.

The guidelines dealt with other important matters, among them objectives, evaluation, materials, and support for the social studies. They advocated clear and specific objectives that would furnish direction to the social studies program. Objectives, including but not limited to performance objectives, should form the primary basis for ongoing evaluation. Evaluation should cover knowledge, skills, and abilities; should come from a variety of sources; should involve both students and teachers; and should extend far beyond formal examinations. Basic goals should be periodically examined. Strategies of instruction and learning activities should "rely on a broad range of learning resources . . . no one textbook is sufficient," the guidelines declared. Finally, the social studies should receive vigorous support in the total school program, with adequate materials, teacher participation in curriculum improvement, incentives and support for further training, and protection against demands to instill particular beliefs or practices or to avoid "thoughtful consideration of controversial topics."

Such were the guidelines that NCSS offered the schools in a time of turmoil. There is little evidence that they were actually used on any substantial scale.[13] Their chief interest lies in what they said about reform thought in the early 1970s and in their attempt to reconcile the "new social studies" with the newer movement that followed. The detente that the guidelines represented lasted throughout the decade. It was a restless detente, constantly threatened by unexamined issues and unexamined assumptions.

Reviews of the "New Social Studies" Projects

In the early 1970s, the "new social studies" projects were the subject of two extensive reviews in Social Education. In each case a sampling of 26 projects was selected, with some additions and subtractions in the second review. All were funded by government or foundation sources rather than commercial organizations. Together, these reviews constitute one of the most comprehensive sources of information about the projects.

In the first review, the editors (Nelson M. Sanders and Marion L. Tanck) sounded a few cautionary notes: Students were by no means so excited by discovery and inquiry as had been hoped, and it was far from established that these methods were effective. The editors pointed out that the research on discovery rarely gave a fair shake to traditional didactic teaching.[14]

The second review featured the use of the NCSS guidelines combined with the Curriculum Materials Analysis System (CMAS) developed by the Social Science Education Consortium. An accompanying editorial note by Karen Wiley and Irving Morrissett of SSEC stated that a current "critical deficiency" in the field was the lack of "analytical and evaluative information on classroom experience with various social studies methods and materials," a condition that subsequently proved difficult to remedy.[15] According to the overview, which was presented in chart form, the projects tended to concentrate on the high school grades, but there were some for the elementary and junior high schools and nine that offered complete K-12 or multigrade materials.[16] The several disciplines were represented by one or two projects each with the exception of economics, which had four. Political science, government, law, and public issues had one each, area studies three. The application of a somewhat freehand version of the NCSS guidelines revealed that in about two-thirds of the projects a "contemporary focus" was "present in the materials" and that such a focus was present in the remainder with "teacher modification."[17] What was classified as a "cultural, racial, ethnic focus" was also present in about three-fourths of the projects, the remainder being about evenly distributed between "no focus" and "present with teacher modification." These "focuses" seem to have been subdued versions of the strong social-problems orientation of the guidelines. Most of the projects dealt with value conflicts, most were flexible, and most involved "active involvement" by the student and the teacher. A majority of the materials were confined to print, and two-thirds offered a variety of learning activities. In both cases variety could be introduced by the teacher.

The classifications used are notoriously difficult to make, and the basis for classification (such as "present in the materials") was not explicated. It seemed, however, that there was a basis for the detente

in the "new social studies" materials themselves, especially with the application of "teacher modification." The five projects which best met the guidelines criteria, meaning that the NCSS criteria were fulfilled without any "teacher modification," were the Anthropology Curriculum Study Project, the Carnegie Slow Learner Project (a latecomer), the High School Geography Project, the Minnesota Project Social Studies, and the Utah State University Analysis of Public Issues. The projects whose characteristics conformed least to the guidelines were the Ohio University project in manpower and education, the University of Colorado's Our Working World, and the Amherst units in American history, all of which lacked both a "cultural, racial, ethnic focus" and variety in media and learning activities.

A Summary View of the 1970s

The 1970s was a curious decade in social studies reform, notable for intense preoccupation with specific topics, problems, and procedures but not for the basic thinking that might have moved the social studies in a clear direction. The terms of its approach and its literature were inherently fragmenting. The project materials themselves did not make notable headway in the schools. No doubt expectations were unreasonably high, as James Becker and others had earlier warned. Even discounting these expectations, their reception remained uncertain and disappointing, especially for a movement into which millions of dollars had been poured. One explanation was undoubtedly that when the "new social studies" dominated reform, little attention was directed to working out the notoriously difficult problems of dissemination, so that there was no system in place when the tornado struck. The "new social studies" were unprepared organizationally as well as ideologically for the radically charged climate in the schools and in the country in the late 1960s and early 1970s. There quickly followed a period of financial retrenchment and reduced school budgets which further discouraged the purchase of expensive materials.

But the problems of the social studies went far beyond their "new social studies" wing If the "new social studies," despite their considerable intellectual and methodological achievements, were inherently

fragmenting, the social problems/self-realization approaches, with their concern for specific topics, were even more fragmenting. Both were challenged by the back-to-basics movement of the 1970s, in which the social studies were not usually defined as "basic"--an extraordinary development in a country in which the education of its citizens had historically been considered worthy of support as the basic purpose of social studies education.

The social studies reform response to back-to-basics was limp. There developed a series of essentially defensive, patchwork, or opportunist measures, most of which involved incorporating the social studies into reading instruction, consumer education, career education, and the like--primarily areas that were receiving federal funds.

Social studies reform in the 1970s had a kaleidoscopic quality. It existed largely in terms of advocacy of a whirling series of particular topics and procedures, some of which had considerable merit but all of which functioned in a compartmentalized fashion. The attempts at reform were also characterized by widespread mindlessness--a willingness to accept the new without much further consideration or examination.

Citizenship Education--Renewed Again

Citizenship education--or "citizen education," as some of its proponents called it in an effort to distinguish it from the sins of the past--trod somewhat uncertain and divergent paths during the 1970s. One of its components, law-related education, though not confined to the social studies, found its most hospitable home there. In 1971 the American Bar Association set up its Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship to serve as a clearinghouse and coordinating agency for the many projects springing up around the country. With its help, law-related education made fairly steady progress, possibly reaching some 10 percent of elementary and secondary school students by the end of the decade.[18] The interest in law-related education stemmed from several sources, among them the upheavals in the schools, the growth of violence in the schools and in the nation, the Watergate scandals, and the accumulating evidence that students' knowledge of basic legal processes, rights, and responsibilities was deteriorating alarmingly. Law-related

education seems to have evoked considerable student interest, which no doubt helped its modest development in the schools. As in other "new" areas, however, lack of teacher preparation was a severe problem.

Another citizenship-education component was valuing, some of whose manifestations have been earlier discussed. These were expanded to include "moral education," based largely on the cognitive moral stages approach of Lawrence Kohlberg, which in the 1970s seems to have been accepted uncritically by many social studies reformers. Both Edwin Fenton, one of the chief advocates of the Kohlberg version of moral education, and Jack R. Fraenkel, one of its chief critics, were, it should be noted, "new social studies" reformers. A special issue of Social Education edited by Fenton (April 1976) was devoted to the subject. Fenton set forth six invariable and "natural" stages of moral development ("preconventional," stages 1 and 3; "conventional," stages 3 and 4; and "the principled level," stages 5 and 6), arguing that changes in stages could be facilitated through educational programs designed to do so, mainly through the use of moral dilemmas.[19] Fraenkel expressed serious reservations about the theory and its uses (including its universality), challenging the assertion that higher-stage reasoning was not only different but morally better than lower-stage reasoning and pointing out the difficulties of classroom application.[20] While acknowledging Kohlberg's contributions, Fraenkel urged teachers to examine critically all valuing approaches. "What is lacking at present is any sort of educational theory which integrates psychological notions about both intellectual and emotional development, together with a philosophical consideration of what values education should be about," he concluded. The exchange was notable in part because it was one of the few instances in the 1970s of forceful debate on an important issue.[21]

Besides law-related education, valuing, and moral education, other topics or emphases directly or somewhat vaguely attached to the idea of citizenship education included global education, consumer education, career education, political education, and education about energy, pollution, environmentalism, and population. Essentially, these represented interest-group pressures on the curriculum, sometimes in the form of funding by voluntary organizations of curricula on particular topics,

sometimes in the form of government funding, often in response to interest-group pressures. Generally speaking, the proponents of these emphases urged their inclusion in the curriculum with little attention to their impact on the curriculum as a whole. Nor was there much of the kind of discussion exemplified in the Fenton/Fraenkel exchange. The field was left to the proponents.

In 1975 the NCSS Board of Directors instructed its executive director to emphasize citizenship education as the main focus of the social studies. Several subsequent NCSS presidential addresses dealt with citizenship education from different perspectives. In 1976 James P. Shaver, who for some 20 years had supported citizenship education as the major purpose of the social studies and had criticized the "new social studies" movement for its disciplinary focus and its inattention to social problems and persistent policy issues, attacked the "mindlessness" of social education.[22] The profession was plagued by "the continued failure to question assumptions," he declared. Shaver pointed to the uncritical acceptance of the role of the disciplines, of relativistic and anti-intellectual valuing and moral education, and of other kinds of "faddism" as well as to confusion about the meaning of academic freedom in the public schools as distinct from higher education, failure to recognize the legitimate concerns of parents, and unreasonable demands on teachers, often coupled with demeaning attitudes toward them. Shaver believed that basic democratic principles provided the cohesive force in our society and the cognitive and affective context for debate and argumentation. He called for the development of rationales "to develop citizenship education curricula with scope and sequence" and with a "spatial dimension" in the community. Shaver anticipated "greater self-awareness and more self-conscious thought about the presumptions from which we develop curricula and teach," which could not happen without massive self-criticism. Otherwise, he declared, social studies would continue to diminish, and rightly so.

In the 1977 NCSS presidential address, Howard D. Mehlinger declared that there was a recent resurgence of interest in "citizen education." He set forth three "needs": "conceptual frameworks," which he thought more necessary than materials production; "perspective-taking," meaning the capacity to see the world from many perspectives; and "ideals," the development of shared beliefs, goals, and purposes.[23]

Neither Shaver nor Mehlinger discussed the role of American--or other--history in the education of citizens. Shaver's antipathy to what he believed was deference to and reliance on the disciplines and Mehlinger's criticisms of how he believed history was taught no doubt helped to account for this omission. But probably another reason was that history itself had largely abandoned its once proud claims to a commanding role in the education of citizens.

References

1. James A. Banks, "Relevant Social Studies for Black Pupils," Social Education 33 (January 1969), pp. 66-69.

2. Nathan Hare, "The Teaching of Black History and Culture in the Secondary Schools," Social Education 33 (April 1969), pp. 385-88.

3. Emily Fuller Gibson, "The Three D's: Distortion, Deletion, Denial," Social Education 33 (April 1969), pp. 405-409.

4. Edwin Fenton, "Crispus Attucks Is Not Enough: The Social Studies and Black Americans," Social Education 33 (April 1969), pp. 396-99.

5. Louis R. Harlan, "Tell It Like It Was: Suggestions on Black History," Social Education 33 (April 1969), pp. 390-95.

6. Stephen S. Baratz and Joan C. Baratz, "Negro Ghetto Children and Urban Education," Social Education 33 (April 1969), pp. 401-404.

7. Hazel W. Hertzberg, "The Challenge of Ethnic Studies," Social Education 36 (May 1972), pp. 469-470.

8. John J. Patrick, "Implications of Political Socialization Research for the Reform of Civic Education," Social Education 33 (January 1969), pp. 15-21.

9. Richard C. Remy, "High School Seniors' Attitudes Toward Their Civics and Government Classes," Social Education 36 (October 1972), pp. 590-97, 622.

10. Judith A. Gillespie and Howard D. Mehlinger, "Teach About Politics in the 'Real' World--the School," Social Education 36 (October 1972), pp. 598-603, 644.

11. For examples, see Sidney B. Simon, "Values-Clarification vs. Indoctrination," Social Education 35 (December 1971), pp. 902-905, 915; and Jean Bernstein et al., "Examining Values in the Upper Grades," Social Education 35 (December 1971), pp. 906-915.

12. "Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines," Social Education 35 (December 1971), pp. 853-869.

13. For evidence about dissemination and specific instances of guideline use, see Richard L. Hart and Victor W. Shapiro, "The NCSS Guidelines: Dissemination and Utilization," Social Education 39 (February 1975), pp. 92-95.

14. Norris L. Sanders and Marion L. Tanck, "A Critical Appraisal of Twenty-Six National Social Studies Projects," Social Education 34 (April 1970), pp. 383-449.

15. Karen Wiley and Irving Morrissett, "Sincerely Yours," Social Education 36 (November 1972), pp. 712-13.

16. "Overview of the Project Materials Analysis," Social Education 36 (November 1972), pp. 720-21.

17. For an explanation of the use of these terms, see James E. Davis and James S. Eckenrod, "A Process for Selecting Instructional Materials," Social Education 36 (November 1972), pp. 714-17.

18. For a brief survey, see Final Report of the U.S. Office of Education Study Group on Law-Related Education (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1979).

19. Edwin Fenton, "Moral Education: The Research Findings," Social Education 40 (April 1976), pp. 188-193.

20. Jack R. Fraenkel, "The Kohlberg Bandwagon: Some Reservations," Social Education 40 (April 1976), pp. 216-222.

21. See the entire April 1976 issue of Social Education as well as the exchange between Fenton and Fraenkel in the January 1977 issue.

22. James P. Shaver, "A Critical View of the Social Studies Profession," Social Education 41 (April 1977), pp. 300-307.

23. Howard D. Mehlinger, "When I See Mr. Jefferson, I'm Going to Tell Him. . . ," Social Education 42 (January 1978), pp. 54-60.

8. TAKING STOCK

History in the 1970s

In the 1970s, American history was fragmented in reform thought. Once Beard and other progressive historians had found in progress through conflict the theme of American history; later the consensus historians found it in accommodation and the absence of conflict. The New Left, revisionist, and Marxist historians of the 1960s and 1970s produced an enormous body of new historical knowledge and interpretation but no synthesis or unifying themes. This fragmentation in historical thinking, undergirded by the fragmentation of American reform, was reflected in the schools in the appearance of black and ethnic history, women's history, local and community history, and family history, all often employing oral history techniques and other varieties of back-to-the-roots history. The 1974 NCSS yearbook, edited by Allan O. Kownslar, Teaching American History: A Quest for Relevancy, combined 1960s and 1970s issues with "new social studies" methodologies: "A study of history can readily serve as a vehicle by which students can learn an applicable mode of inquiry, develop self-concepts, successfully empathize with the past, continue to clarify values, learn to recognize and to cope with suspected myths and stereotypes, and to ask critical questions about the past, present, and future," the editor confidently asserted.[1] The sample lessons provided dealt with a pre-1800 Indian group, a Confederate soldier's life during the Civil War, the women's equal rights movement, Appalachian coal miners, the "melting pot myth" in regard to "black culture," the American city, "Who is qualified for the presidency?," and the environment. Most of the articles on American

history in Social Education during the 1970s were similarly topicalized or proceduralized, with very little concern for conceptual or synthetic problems in school history.

Frances FitzGerald's comments on American history textbooks in America Revised: History Textbooks in the 20th Century fitfully illuminated this picture.[2] Her most cogent and compelling section dealt with how the 1970s history texts were manufactured, standardized, and adopted. While overgeneralized, it was also the section based most firmly on direct investigation. To an uncanny degree, however, the confused organization, rapidly shifting foci, and jumbled history of the book mirrored the incoherence, confusion, and uncertainties about the American past that FitzGerald found in the 1970s texts. Like social studies reform in the 1970s, the book was full of definitive judgments. As history, it had a curiously static quality, as if it had become stuck in the 1950s when the author was a student. Her chief historical mentor seems appropriately to have been the eminent Columbia University historian and textbook author Richard Hofstadter, who died shortly after the 1968 revolt on the Columbia campus--with which he had evinced little sympathy. Hofstadter had contributed to the 1950s critiques of the schools and to the attacks on the American reform tradition in general and on the progressive historians in particular. In Hofstadter's conception, which relied heavily on a social science approach, progressivism was essentially a "status revolution," an attempt to defend and retain white Anglo-Saxon Protestant status and values against the twin encroachments of urbanization and mass immigration. His history could be used both to support and to criticize the "new social studies" and at least some sections of the social problems/self-realization social studies. FitzGerald, who showed no awareness of the severe criticisms of Hofstadter by other historians, embraced his history as her own, adding to it her experiences as a student in the 1950s and subsequently as a critic of the Vietnam war. She did not, however, add more than a smattering to knowledge of the historical development of the social studies, which was treated episodically and with a certain amount of pop sociology. In the absence of a living and vigorous historical tradition in the social studies on which to draw, it is probably unfair to expect much beyond this, although it was reasonable to expect a certain modesty

in assertion. Nor did the book reveal knowledge of or contact with schools, classrooms, teachers, and students. In many ways FitzGerald echoed the 1950s critique of the social studies, with some 1960s and 1970s variations added.

The result was a deeply felt, deeply flawed, and influential work whose impact was probably due not only to the prominence of the author but also to the fact that it offered a little something to almost every critic. Perhaps the book also fed a growing hunger for historical explanation and interpretation of the current state of social studies education. Whatever its strengths and weaknesses, America Revised revived interest in examining the textbook in terms that went beyond the treatment of particular topics.

Multiethnic Education

Some of FitzGerald's sharpest strictures were reserved for the practice of sprinkling American history texts with historical examples of 1960s and 1970s protest movements--notably those of blacks, other "minorities," and women--without much regard for their integration into the narrative or into a coherent view of the nature of American nationality. By the end of the 1970s, the emphasis in ethnic studies was shifting to "multiethnic education," partly in recognition of this problem. For example, James A. Banks, a leading advocate of ethnic studies, had moved from his position of almost exclusive concentration on black studies to a multicultural approach. Multiethnic or multicultural education, however, turned out to have problems of its own.

The purpose of multiethnic education was to develop ethnic awareness and sensitivity and to combat prejudice, thus giving a child both a firm and positive "self-concept" rooted in a sense of "cultural identity" and a positive and informed attitude toward persons of other ethnic groups. Essentially what was called for was an emphasis on the positive aspects and contributions of each group, with a favorable account of its heritage and history. Underlying this conception was cultural pluralism as the basis of nationality, replacing the rejected melting pot. The United States was perceived as a nation composed of a series of distinct cultures, each stemming from a country or culture outside the United

States and also shaped by the continued experience of the group within this country. All--or almost all--children were assigned to be members of various ethnic groups. (Theoretically, of course, the "failure" of the melting pot meant that persons of diverse national or racial "origins" did not exist, or existed only in small numbers.) The multiethnic view posited, in addition to these distinct cultures, a "dominant culture," historically and at present. Since the melting pot had presumably failed, this dominant culture could not very well be a melting-pot product, as melting-pot proponents claimed. Although the "dominant culture" was often referred to as "pluralistic," it was also believed to be overwhelmingly white, Protestant, and Anglo-Saxon. The short term for this was "WASP," which in fact seemed to refer to a sort of imperial ethnic group. And, as one writer in Social Education put it in 1978, "the racial and ethnic prejudice problem in America is, of course, WASP centered."[3]

Just who were these prejudiced "WASPs"? In the multiethnic education perspective, each ethnic group was to be seen in its inherant variety and diversity and from its own perspectives. Not so "WASPs," who were as ill defined and undifferentiated as they were powerful and prejudiced. The term quickly became a new stereotype, and its frequent and unself-conscious use by social studies educators an unrecognized and therefore unexamined and uncombated form of prejudice and bigotry. With the rise of ethnic self-consciousness among American Hispanics and the mass immigration from Spanish-speaking countries, "Anglo," "Anglo-centric," and "Anglo-American" were added to the ethnic vocabulary of social studies educators as terms referring to the "dominant culture," the dominant language, or both. The preservation and cultivation of the "home language" in the schools was viewed as necessary for cultural self-respect and integrity and for educational achievement, while English was also to be acquired.

Multiethnic or multicultural education was in practice essentially "bicultural," a circumstance deplored by multiethnic educators. The two cultures were those of the group in question and the dominant one. Each group was compartmentalized; groups were not considered in reference to each other, except insofar as each had experienced denigration and prejudice by the dominant culture. When attempts were made to combine

them--that is, to make them truly "multicultural"--problems arose, as was demonstrated in a 1978 article and responses to it in Social Education. Chester A. Youngblood advocated the presence of blacks at the "program determination level" for all bilingual-bicultural education programs for Mexican-American children and the "thoughtful infusion of a meaningful Black American element into bilingual-bicultural curricular materials" for these children.[4] Youngblood argued that both were "visible minorities" who often lived side by side and were mingled in schools and classrooms, and that they shared a "common set of harsh realities and new hopes" and a "growing sense of ethnic pride and destiny." Youngblood asserted that at least some Mexican-American children were prejudiced against blacks. He further argued that few, if any, bilingual/bicultural programs could exist without the tacit or explicit approval of key representatives of "the Anglo-American establishment" and that what was missing was "a viable Black American presence."

Of the four responses to Youngblood's proposal, all favored a multicultural approach in principle but most were disturbed by his focus on blacks and Mexican-Americans only. James A. Banks pointed to the lack of well-developed models for incorporating content about several ethnic groups into the curriculum, observing that this was a modest beginning, while urging the inclusion in multiethnic materials of a wide range of ethnic groups "relating and interacting."[5] Carlos E. Cortés, who agreed with the overall thrust of the article, argued that the absence of blacks in Mexican-American materials was a particular case of a general failure "to deal effectively with or accurately reflect our nation's multicultural diversity," an instance of "mainstream ethnocentrism."[6] Cortés also warned that in ethnic materials we must avoid "the excessive ethnocentrism" that had for two centuries characterized "mainstream" materials. Bilingual/bicultural education, he averred, builds on the "variety of home languages in our nation." It was important to preserve linguistic diversity rather than to destroy or demean it or allow it to atrophy, especially in view of the millions being spent on language training programs.

The other responses were more critical. Theodore Kaltsounis raised the question of a "hidden agenda": Did Youngblood want to help the Chicano child, or to make blacks more acceptable to Chicanos? Why did

he suggest asking Chicanos to study blacks but not vice versa?[7] Kaltsounis reported that Chicanos felt that for the moment their first priority should be to raise the self-concept of the Chicano children in a situation where "their language and culture is depreciated," after which they would be ready for a genuine multicultural approach. Kaltsounis raised further questions about whether physical proximity equaled identification. "What really brings people together is a common sense of values," Kaltsounis argued, and Chicanos believe that "great cultural values," family relationships, and language differ in the two groups. Kaltsounis also reported that "as a result of their more favorable position in society, the Blacks may appear to the Chicano children as another dominant group, rather than as the group with which they can identify." As to Youngblood's call for a "viable Black American presence at the program determination level," the author reported that to his Chicano students this had already been accomplished and that what was missing was "Chicanos in high level administrative jobs." They even feared that former victims might become oppressors, he reported, adding that they also pointed out that black culture had always been interwoven with their own. Kaltsounis concluded that the Chicanos' desire to stress their own culture and to control their own programs was right and that ultimately, when they felt "in control of their own destiny and the rest of society feels less self-righteous," they would become part of "the same program for all Americans."

The final response by Geneva Gay severely criticized not Youngblood's major ideas but their explication.[8] She emphasized the need for a broad approach: the balanced, focused, and appreciative study of many ethnic groups; the actual examination of stereotypes and prejudices held by each; and the need to avoid pitting one ethnic group against another. As organizing principles for early childhood education, she suggested common or universal concerns held by the entire spectrum of ethnic groups in the United States: "identity, survival, personal integrity and fulfillment and injustices." She favored "an interactive approach" which would encourage "the use of two-directional multiethnic perspectives." This "could also help to dispel the notion that 'ethnics' are anyone other than Anglo Americans, particularly racial minorities, and that the real--although hidden--agenda of multicultural education is to

facilitate the assimilation of excluded ethnic groups into mainstream institutions and their acceptance of Anglo-centric norms and values."

Not until 1979 did the melting pot find a defender in the pages of Social Education in the person of John Jarolimek, a self-described "white ethnic."[9] The criticism of the melting pot is to some extent contradictory, Jarolimek argued. Some have alleged it to be a myth, while others (particularly white ethnics) declare that it has stripped them of their identity; that is, that it has been successful in facilitating assimilation. "But the critics cannot have it both ways--either it was a myth and did not really exist, or it was a powerful system of indoctrination imposed on aliens. Critics of the melting pot will need to resolve this contradiction," he wrote. Jarolimek distinguished sharply between the experience of "white ethnics" and the far worse experience of blacks.

Next Jarolimek asked his readers to put themselves in the position of an educated, middle-class, white American at the time when mass immigration to the United States was part of the largest movement of human beings in the history of the world. "This influx from abroad, mainly of uneducated peasant peoples who did not speak a familiar language and had unpronounceable names, precipitated very strong feelings against the immigrant," the author wrote. He asked his readers what would have been their attitude towards these immigrants and whether they would have supported "ethnic purity" in their neighborhoods, advocated bilingual instruction, or championed multiethnic and multicultural education. Would they have been worried if half the population of their city was foreign born? "You bet you would have worried," Jarolimek answered. "The situation had all the elements that could have led to a national disaster. But it is to the everlasting credit of this nation that it did what it should have done with the immigrants--put them to work, sent their children to school, encouraged them to settle the lands of the frontier, and taught them the values of individualism, freedom, democracy, civic responsibility, and respect for others," encouraging them "to break out of the ethnic enclosures and become part of the mainstream of America." Jarolimek contended that "this melting pot" or "the process of cultural assimilation," under whatever label, had "worked remarkably well."

Why, then, Jarolimek asked, did the emphasis around the mid-1960s shift to pluralism, and what have been the benefits therefrom? Jarolimek did not answer the first question. As to the second, he concluded that pluralism and the ethnic heritage revival had improved the lives of millions. Ironically, this was accomplished "by bringing them into the mainstream of the social and economic life of this nation." There was now greater awareness and acceptance of ethnic individuals and groups. The multiplicity of American roots "has been and can continue to be the source of strength and richness for us as a people," he declared.

"Where do we go from here?" Jarolimek asked. "We have done about as much as we ought to do in promoting ethnic identity and building ethnic awareness," he stated. Further promotion was likely to be counterproductive for the individual, who should be judged on his own merits. For ethnic groups, separation and segregation rather than integration might result, and they might suffer simply because they are minorities: "We must not allow pluralism to flourish to the extent that it will shatter any sense of common identity that is essential to the political and social health of the nation. If this happens it will lead to civil strife and disorder as it has in every place in the world where pluralism, rather than unity, has been emphasized. . . . Pluralism has not had a good track record in enhancing benevolent feelings and peaceful relationships between and among people."

Jarolimek closed by making five recommendations:

--Focus on immigration history seen as a confluence of world cultures transformed in the New World, the ethnicities of Americans being key variants of but by no means the same as their parent cultures.

--Educate teachers thoroughly about ethnicity as a social and psychological phenomenon and provide them with more information about many ethnic groups and their history, problems, and concerns.

--Keep attachment to one's own ethnicity within reasonable limits; refrain from mixing ethnicity with foreign-policy formation; soft-pedal the assertive aspects of ethnicity; and discourage politicizing the ethnic issue or using it as a weapon for social power.

--Focus on the specific learning problems that children from particular ethnic groups may have, in order to help them succeed in school and in life as American citizens.

--Become, as teachers, better students of society and of what societies need to thrive and grow, especially in so heterogeneous a country as the United States.

In a country where everyone is now or once was an alien, he urged attention to the passage from Exodus that warns, "you shall not molest or oppress an alien, for you were once aliens yourself in the land of Egypt."

The 1979 NCSS Guidelines

In 1979, the NCSS revised its 1971 guidelines, with some minor changes that reflected new or renewed topics or emphases that had emerged during the decade.[10] The nation and citizenship education reappeared rather modestly and in a more favorable light. Some comments on basic skills were added. The list of problems was expanded to include energy, sexism, and nuclear proliferation, and most problems were specifically seen as "global." Ideas from political science and geography were often deemed to be "culturally biased" as well as "badly out of date." Women were added to the list of those whom school history ignored, while "Hispanics" were substituted for "Chicanos" in the enumeration. There were various favorable references to global perspectives and "Planet Earth." The statement that social problems were "the major concern of the social studies" was omitted. Criticism of the schools was slightly softened. There was no further elucidation of the thorny problems of scope and sequence, problems versus disciplines as a basis for the curriculum, and the relationships of the social sciences to each other. The new guidelines even dropped the earlier admonition to select "knowledge of most worth." In these commissions and omissions, the revised guidelines reflected the course of social studies reform in the 1970s. What did not appear was any recognition that the social studies were in deep trouble in the schools.

Alarms and Surveys

One of the first alarms was sounded over the state of history in the schools. In 1975 Richard S. Kirkendall, executive secretary of the

Organization of American Historians, reported on a survey by representatives in most of the states.[11] History in the schools and colleges was in crisis, Kirkendall wrote. While in some parts of the country school history was "stable," in many others a move away from history was reported--a trend variously attributed to a concern with contemporary problems; losses to the social sciences; emphasis on "concepts"; the assumption that history was not a practical subject; competition from career education, consumer education, multicultural education, and other specialized topics; and student views of history as irrelevant or impractical. In both schools and colleges (the situation was even more bleak in the latter), the dropping of various types of requirements was deemed a contributing and probably a major factor. Teacher-certification requirements were reported to be quite fluid. Many historians feared that students were fast losing a "sense of history" and historical perspective.

Shortly before the Kirkendall report was published, both the OAH and the AHA set up committees on teaching, initiated columns on teaching in their respective newsletters, and began to sponsor conferences for both school and college teachers. A periodical, The History Teacher, founded in 1968, was taken over in 1972 by the Society for History Education, which also sponsored a newsletter, Network News Exchange. The History Teacher gave the profession, for the first time in decades, a magazine devoted to history teaching at all levels.

In the colleges in the 1970s there was probably more experimentation in history teaching than there had been for several decades. This trend was quite similar to developments in secondary school history, incorporating a focus on specialized topics. Renewed activity by the professional associations, classroom experimentation, and the advent of the magazine on teaching helped to create a new generation of historians with considerable interest in teaching. These factors helped to some extent to breach the walls between school and college history. But the new generation of historians-as-teachers was still far removed from the centers of power in the professional historical associations.

The historical associations did not connect history's problems in the colleges with history's problems in the schools until the mid-1970s, with the publication of the Kirkendall report. Similarly, most social

studies reformers did not seem to connect history's problems in the schools with those of the social studies. Until almost two-thirds of the way through the decade, there was little recognition that the field of social studies itself, as distinct from its various parts, was in trouble. The failure to connect the problems of history with the problems of the social studies may be attributed to the lack of interest in history and in the curriculum as a whole on the part of both major reform movements of the 1960s and 1970s. The failure to realize that the social studies as a whole were in trouble is more difficult to explain, although it is connected with the first. No doubt one reason was the preoccupation of reformers with the fortunes of particular aspects of the social studies rather than with the whole field. Another was probably the general lack of interest in long-term trends. Yet another was the distance of national reformers from the schools.

Not until 1977 did Social Education publish a survey which demonstrated that the social studies as a field were in trouble. Richard E. Gross, who conducted the study, was from the generation of social studies educators who came to maturity before the movements of the 1960s and 1970s. Perhaps as a result of having lived through several social studies reform movements, he had a historical perspective that made him sensitive to change. Gross reported that the traditional curricular pattern established by the 1916 NEA committee had "finally been shattered." Between 1961 and 1973 total secondary school enrollments had risen by 59 percent, but social studies enrollments (at least since 1972) were mixed, ranging from significant increases to moderate or drastic decreases, with a "debacle" in the primary grades. In both 1961 and 1973, U.S. history, U.S. government, and world history enrolled the largest numbers of social studies students. The first two more than held their own in terms of percentages of rising enrollments; the third did not and, in fact, scored only a 5-percent increase. Absolute enrollments in "Problems of Democracy" and civics courses fell drastically, the percentage changes being -23 percent and -39 percent respectively. The number of 9-12 high schools offering U.S. history dropped from 73 percent in 1961 to 53.3 percent in 1973, and those offering world history dropped from 68.6 percent to 49.5 percent.[13] Only 32 percent of the junior high schools (grades 7-8) offered U.S. history.

Gross's use of the term "shattered" probably overstated the case--"severely eroded" would be more accurate.

The figures clearly revealed "an invasion of the social studies by the social sciences," Gross reported. The percentage change in high school economics was +102 percent, in sociology +175 percent, and in psychology a whopping +323 percent. These courses, however, enrolled a relatively small number of students. In grades 7-12, economics was taught in 36 percent of the schools, and it enrolled 7 percent of the students in these schools. For the same grades, sociology was also taught in 36 percent of the schools with 8 percent of their enrollments, while psychology was taught in 35 percent of these schools, with 9 percent enrolled. Other figures reported were for area studies, taught in 14 percent of the 7-12 grades with 5-14 percent enrolled, and ethnic studies, in 10 percent with 17 percent enrolled. Anthropology appeared in only 6 percent, with 5 percent enrolled, while law studies appeared in 14 percent of grades 7-12 with 7-percent enrollment. Social studies had not maintained itself in the growth of total pupil enrollment in secondary education, Gross concluded.

Patterns, of course, varied from state to state. A few states--for example, New Hampshire, Florida, and Wisconsin--maintained or even increased their enrollments. Pennsylvania was considered typical, with losses in world history, geography, POD, and economics and gains in government, psychology, and sociology as well as in state history and government and U.S. history. In Indiana, with a 15,000 increase in high school enrollment between 1970 and 1975, social studies enrollment dropped by 68,000. Even worse was the situation in some of the highly populated states. In California high school enrollment increased by 60,000 between 1970 and 1975 but social studies enrollment dropped by 292,000. In New York state total secondary school enrollment increased, while social studies enrollment dropped. Texas, with a growing population, showed severe declines in high school social studies.

The trend in state social studies requirements was downward, Gross reported. His study of local districts showed that one-fourth had reduced requirements, which he believed indicated that the movement against the social studies was "largely a grass-roots/community-centered development."

The study reported several interesting findings about teachers. Most seemed to feel quite free to deal with controversial issues. According to several California studies, teachers also said that they were using "inquiry, conceptual, broad-field, and simulation-game approaches." Gross's respondents agreed that teaching styles "have been materially affected by the 'new social studies' projects"--whose materials, however, were used to a very limited extent. Many teachers had not even heard of the projects. What then, Gross asked, was the explanation for the use of "new social studies" methods or even terms? The teachers were not hearing about them from the professional literature or social studies organizations, Gross reported, since they seldom read the former or belonged to the latter. Probably the explanation lay in the incorporation of aspects of the "new social studies" into conventional textbooks, curriculum guides, and inservice programs, he believed.

Gross stated that "a goodly number of our correspondents believed that we are past the mini-course bandwagon, generalized ethnic offerings, and the anarchical curriculum itself." Games and simulations, on the other hand, seemed to be more popular, and "concerns about law and citizenship will continue to grow."

Gross saw two possible futures. One included "a steadily declining curricular field, diffused and balkanized, often turning backwards and up panacea alleys, increasingly delimited because of its own lack of purpose and direction and by the failure to agree upon a core of socio-civic learnings." The other promised "renewed and unified efforts at convincingly defining the fundamental contributions of the field toward helping meet individual and societal needs."

NSF Studies and the NCSS Review

A somewhat contrasting description was presented by James P. Shaver, O.L. Davis, Jr., and Suzanne W. Helburn in 1979, on the basis of extensive studies of science, mathematics, and social science education. In 1976 the National Science Foundation had commissioned three types of studies covering these subjects: a national survey of teachers and administrators, a review of the 1955-1975 research literature, and a series of ethnographic case studies in the schools, done during the 1975-1976 school year. NCSS, along with seven other professional educa-

tion organizations, was asked to submit a proposal for an interpretive report on the various areas. The NCSS social studies plan was approved, and the report was prepared by the authors named above. An abbreviated version was published in the February 1979 issue of Social Education.[14] The latter was thus at several removes from the data and necessarily offered only what the authors considered the most basic findings:

--The teacher was the key to what social studies could be for any student. The textbook was the dominant instructional tool, forming the basis for large-group, teacher-controlled recitation and lecture. Teachers saw the textbook as authoritative, inquiry as too demanding and largely unproductive. The "knowing" expected of students was largely information oriented. History and government, with geography included in elementary and junior high school, constituted most of the curriculum. Materials from at least one of the "new social studies" projects were being used in 10-25 percent of the classrooms, at a liberal estimate. Little attention to societal issues or to interdisciplinary teaching was found.

--A major goal of all teachers, including social studies teachers, was socialization. Probably this meant preparing students for the skill, subject matter, and decorum demands of the school and especially those of the next grade. Another goal was to teach students how to learn from printed and other instructional materials. Citizenship, another component of socialization, involved the advocacy of "American values" and a commitment to inculcate them. While the degree, methods, and specific values differed, almost all teachers indoctrinated. Teachers and parents believed that preserving and perpetuating the values of the society were the functions of its formal educational system and that knowing a certain content was an important means of socialization, not just an end in itself. Because teachers shared community views, they did not consider teaching controversial issues a problem. Similarly, teachers generally supported the "back-to-basics" movement, especially because of the emphasis on reading, so necessary for textbook-based instruction. Students found social studies uninteresting, and student motivation was a major concern of teachers, but generally they did not make a connection between students' lack of motivation and textbook/content-based, teacher-dominated instruction.

--Teachers were concerned about different aspects of teaching than were professors and curriculum developers, who rarely appreciated the formers' interest in classroom management and socialization. Teachers tended to seek help from each other. The "new social studies" materials, which challenged teachers' classroom-management techniques, had purposes (such as inquiry and cognitive learning as an end) which were seen or sensed by teachers to conflict with their own. Teachers believed that these materials were likely to work only in exceptional situations, with elite students who had learned "the basics," including self-discipline. In the authors' opinion, the legitimacy of this view had not been adequately recognized by social studies specialists.

--Social studies education offered contrasts and contradictions, the authors concluded, with a dominant stability in modes of instruction and "a national sameness" in curriculum. Because teachers have a great deal of freedom, there was variety within the same school, and some brilliant as well as unimaginative teaching. The "new data" on the preponderance of textbook recitation/discussion in the social studies led the authors to reflect on its continuance. Was it realistic to expect inquiry teaching from all teachers, considering the daily demands and constraints and their own lack of experience with inquiry-model teaching? The teachers' emphasis on socialization also raised questions in the authors' minds about the legitimate role of schools.

The NCSS review did not report the curricular fragmentation and incoherence noted by Gross. The two reports may not be quite so contradictory as they seem, however. To some extent they dealt with different aspects of teaching and with different time periods. Gross dealt with a slightly earlier time, when "the mini-course bandwagon" was trundling along more briskly. During the period between his data collection and that of the case studies on which the NCSS review was based, this bandwagon was disappearing over the horizon.

The NCSS review relied heavily on the NSF case studies of 11 high schools and their feeder schools in the East, South, North, and West. The schools were located in communities of different sizes and had different types of populations, reflecting diversity of class, race, and income. A balanced representation was one aim of the case studies; another was the requirement that an experienced field researcher be

available for on-site observation for a substantial amount of time. The investigators (or "stars," as the NSF report called them) went their own ways, describing what they found "in a way that would be useful to any other person who could not be there to visit for himself." The result was that each study contains a great deal of information and a variety of interpretations, but as a group the studies are very difficult to compare.

The authors of the NCSS review, faced with the tremendous mass of material in the three reports, were well aware of the difficulty of presenting it fairly and coherently, and they urged their readers to look at the documents themselves. They attempted, not to analyze any of the documents, but rather to "respect" their findings. By relying so heavily on the case studies, they got close to some classrooms, but it was a highly episodic closeness which was open, as they pointed out, to varying interpretations. What rightly permeated the NCSS review was empathy with the teacher and with the "realities" of the school and classroom, as well as a concern with the ongoing life of the schools which had been noticeably absent in most of the reform literature of the previous decades.

The reader who searches through the case studies for hard evidence about the social studies quickly appreciates the extreme difficulty of summarizing and interpreting it. This reader found a more troubled picture than one generally conveyed by the NCSS report, perhaps partly because of the latter's judicious and empathetic style. For example, the numerous instances of student lack of interest or outright hostility, referred to quietly in the report, emerge vividly in the case studies. These also contain a sufficient number of references to discussions of social issues or problems in social studies classrooms to raise questions about the NCSS review's assertion that such issues received slight attention. However, the classroom reports were so episodic that it is impossible to tell whether social issues received sustained treatment--or, indeed, what specific content <u>did</u> receive such treatment in the social studies.

The NCSS report did not pay much attention to teachers' or administrators' perceptions of the importance of the social studies or to the problem of scope and sequence, both of which are surely related to the

sense of purpose of the profession. Some information on these matters may be gleaned from the NSF national survey, which reported what its sampling of teachers and administrators perceived to be "a serious problem," "somewhat of a problem," or "not a significant problem." The survey revealed rather widespread concern among teachers of mathematics, science, and social studies and among principals about how their subjects were regarded. A majority of social studies teachers in grades 10-12 (57%) saw "the belief that this subject is less important than other subjects" as either "serious" (18%) or "somewhat of a problem" (39%). In grades 7-9, the figures were lower, 9 percent rating it as "serious" and 36 percent as "somewhat of a problem." Clearly, teachers in the higher grades were more worried about how their subject was regarded. In marked contrast, only 4 percent of the state social studies supervisors viewed this as a "serious problem" in grades 7-12. School principals, however, were even more inclined than teachers to view the problem as "serious," especially in the junior high grades.

Articulation across levels was also a matter of concern to many social studies teachers. About the same percentages of teachers in junior and senior high schools regarded articulation as a "serious problem" (13% and 14% respectively), but in the high school those seeing it as "a somewhat serious problem" increased to 49 percent in grades 10-12 (from 37% in 7-9), again showing more concern in the high schools. Principals agreed with teachers' ratings of "serious," but again, only 4 percent of the state social studies supervisors viewed 7-12 articulation as "a serious problem." It seems that those in charge on the state level were out of touch with local schools on these matters.

Whether or not articulation was identified as a problem, the case-study investigators found that it was weak. In the senior high school, one or two years of social studies (more often two) were required at the sites used in the study, the most common courses being world history and U.S. history. Electives were offered under many different titles--the NSF summary lists 12 as examples. In the junior high school, a social studies course was typically required each year--usually world or regional geography, U.S. history, civics, or state history.[15]

Taken together, the Gross survey and the NCSS report offer a great deal of information on the state of social studies education. It must

be kept in mind that they looked at somewhat different phenomena and used different approaches. Gross reported long-term trends and covered the whole country. The case studies (CSSE) dealt with only some districts, and the observations were made over a fairly long period during the 1975-1976 school year. Gross was interested in scope and sequence, a minor emphasis in the NSF study. The NCSS report dealt primarily with the teacher and the classroom; the Gross report did not.

There is agreement between the two on the rather modest impact of the "new social studies" project materials. Gross found more evidence of the use of "new social studies" terminology, if not procedures, perhaps because of his reliance on California studies. There are numerous problems, to be sure, about what "inquiry" is. The NCSS report presents a persuasive explanation of the failure of the "new social studies" project materials to find a warmer welcome in the schools. The two reports are also in substantial agreement about teachers' freedom to handle controversial issues. The NCSS report points out that since teachers tend to agree with community views, they do not relinquish their integrity by avoiding "uncomfortable" topics.

The effort to find out what was actually happening in the schools was one of the more promising developments of the 1970s. It was a formidable task, considering the number and diversity of schools, classrooms, teachers, students, and communities and the inadequacy of research methodology. The several reports described here sought primarily to discover what had happened as a result of two decades of reform effort, particularly the impact of the "new social studies." In the process they turned up much information on the general state of affairs.

In social studies reform the decade of the 1970s opened with a flourish but closed on a somewhat retrospective note. There was a pervasive sense that a period had ended but a new one had not yet begun. Such a moment should be used for reflection. In the concluding section of this paper I outline what seem to me to be some of the current issues in our field, along with making brief allusions to the past and some predictions about the future.

References

1. Allan O. Kownslar, ed., Teaching American History: A Quest for Relevancy (Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1974).

2. Frances FitzGerald, America Revised: History Textbooks in the Twentieth Century (Boston: Atlantic Little, Brown, 1979).

3. "Chester E. Youngblood: Response to Readers," Social Education 42 (March 1978), p. 199.

4. Chester E. Youngblood, "Putting Black Into Brown in Early Childhood Curricular Materials," Social Education 42 (March 1978), pp. 188-190.

5. "Reactions of James A. Banks," Social Education 42 (March 1978), pp. 191-92.

6. "Reactions of Carlos E. Cortes," Social Education 42 (March 1978), pp. 192-93.

7. "Reactions of Theodore Kaltsounis," Social Education 42 (March 1978), pp. 194-96.

8. "Reactions of Geneva Gay," Social Education 42 (March 1978), pp. 196-98.

9. John Jarolimek, "Born Again Ethnics: Pluralism of Modern America," Social Education 43 (March 1979), pp. 204-209.

10. "Revising the NCSS Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines," Social Education 43 (April 1979), pp. 261-278.

11. Richard S. Kirkendall, "The Status of History in the Schools," Journal of American History 62 (1975), pp. 557-570.

12. Richard F. Gross, "The State of the Social Studies in the Public Schools of the United States: Facts and Impressions of a National Survey," Social Education 41 (March 1977), pp. 194-200, 205.

13. These 1961 figures, not included in the Gross survey, are from Logan J. Osternhorf and Paul J. Horn, Current Offerings, Enrollments, and Curriculum Practices in Public Secondary Schools, 1972-73 (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1976), p. 12.

14. James P. Shaver, O.L. Davis, Jr., and Suzanne W. Helburn, "The Status of Social Studies Education: Impressions From Three NSF Studies," Social Education 43 (February 1979), pp. 150-53.

15. "The K-12 Curriculum," in Case Studies in Science Education (Urbana-Champaign, Ill.: University of Illinois, 1978), pp. 30, 29.

9. SUMMARY AND COMMENT

By now it is much more evident than it has been for the past two decades that in seeking change, one should not ignore what it is one seeks to change and simply assume that it needs changing. Reform movements need a much wider and more solid information base about the classroom than they have hitherto been willing or able to develop. The availability of such data would not guarantee that specific reform movements would draw on it, but it would at least give those who evaluate such movements a basis for comparison.

The National Assessment of Educational Progress now provides some of the results of instruction and by this time also furnishes a basis for identifying trends, but it does not give us information about what is going on in the classroom. An ongoing national assessment focused on the classroom would be difficult and expensive, but even a recognition of the urgency of the problem and an effort to come to grips with it would be salutary.

Neglect of School and Classroom Realities

The dominant reform movements of the 1960s and 1970s were strangely oblivious to school and classroom realities, a circumstance that seriously harmed their effectiveness. The reformers assumed that they already knew what was going on, and they tended to underestimate the problems as well as the consequences of change. They were certainly not the first would-be reformers to make such an assumption, but they were unusually insensitive.

The reform efforts which are relatively easy to assess are recommendations for changes in curricular patterns. Course titles can be

ascertained, and they tell us something even though their specific content varies. The three national efforts that had the most lasting impact on the social studies--the reports of the Committees of Ten and Seven and the 1916 NEA report--were much more sensitive to realities of the schools and classrooms than were the "new social studies" or the social problems/self-realization social studies movements. The AHA Committee of Seven, it will be remembered, began its deliberations with a study of the schools in the United States and Western Europe, an investigation that included widespread consultation with teachers. The committee members had a reasonably broad base of information which was buttressed by their own experiences in the schools. The Seven tried to avoid making recommendations that had not already been tested in some schools. The members of the 1916 NEA committee had extensive experience in the schools and knowledge of developments during the previous quarter-century. They sought modification of the earlier curriculum, not a sharp break with it. All these committees had a far deeper understanding of the ongoing socialization function of the schools than had reformers of the 1960s and 1970s, and they were broadly concerned with the role of the schools in a democratic society rather than with narrow or highly specialized interests. These were not the only reasons for the earlier reports, but they were essential reasons. The Ten and Seven and the 1916 NEA committee established a tradition of investigation before recommendation that was followed by many of the other committees of the period.

The AHA Commission on the Social Studies in the 1930s, while sharing a broad perspective with the earlier committees, did not propose a curriculum scope and sequence, and the commission's influence is therefore much more difficult to assess. It is certain, however, that the schools and teachers were unable and unwilling to assume the role the commission advocated. The conflict on this matter seriously divided the commission and constituted the chief criticism of its conclusions and recommendations. This is not to say that the work of the commission was not important or influential. It does suggest, however, that when national reformers lose touch with the schools and classrooms, they limit the impact and the usefulness of their work.

Another example of a reform effort that overlooked the realities of schools and classrooms was the Citizenship Education Project sponsored by Teachers College, Columbia University, in the 1940s and 1950s. The CEP, like the "new social studies" projects, had prestige and support, was well financed, used a team/project approach, conducted many teacher workshops, and concentrated on materials production. The CEP proposed to install its version of social studies education in all American schools within a 15-year period, thus sharing with the "new social studies" an inflated conception of its capacity to affect change.

The CEP started with an advantage that the "new social studies" lacked--its personnel had had considerable experience with the schools. But their collective experience lay in administration rather than in teaching, and it was the classroom teacher who got short shrift from the CEP. In its zeal for speedy universality, the CEP neglected the teachers and students who would be using the materials and the need to build a solid support system within the schools for its materials and modes of instruction. The CEP was an elaborate structure built over the schools, not in them.

The CEP wanted all schools to extend classroom activities into the community. During the previous half-century, student/community projects had involved comparatively few schools. To induce all schools to engage in such activities on a sustained and systematic basis would have required changes in the conduct and organization of schools which were beyond the capacity of a single project, and certainly beyond one that airily brushed aside the difficulties and largely ignored the situation of classroom teachers. Whether such massive change could have been effected at all is a serious question. But it is reasonable to suppose that if the CEP had been willing to concentrate on building a base of support in a relatively few school systems and had not spread itself so thin, it could have, by attempting less, accomplished more.

It is somewhat chastening to consider how frequently various versions of "inquiry" have been advocated during the past century, beginning with the first methods textbook in the 1880s. The Committee of Ten made some mild suggestions of this sort, and the Committee of Seven developed advocacy of the inquiry method much further. Both the Ten and the Seven also favored recitation as an alternative to lecture, while

staunchly opposing it in its rapid-fire question-and-answer, rote-memorization versions. As in the case of the curriculum, they took care not to go too far beyond classroom practice. Since then most reformers have looked askance at recitation and advocated some version of inquiry.

Despite its low esteem among reformers, the available evidence suggests that recitation has been historically, and is at present, the typical mode of instruction in the social studies (and in other school subjects as well). The term "recitation" is open to several interpretations, from a mechanical catechism to a more open and free-flowing discussion, but it is always led and structured by the teacher.[1] My own suspicion is that, while recitation has dominated, inquiry has been used in the schools more frequently than is generally admitted. I also suspect that the rapid-fire question-and-answer method is much less common than it was a century ago. There can be little question, however, that social studies instruction has been and is overwhelmingly teacher-dominated.

Some of my own explanations for the dominance of recitation are as follows. First, it is an excellent method of mastering factual information. Second, it provides for student participation, which the lecture does not, and most teachers believe in some type of student involvement. Third, it leaves the teacher in control of the classroom and makes clear the roles of students and teacher. There are very few teachers, in my view, who do not wish to remain in control of the classroom, whether or not that control is obvious.

The validity of these explanations notwithstanding, the persistence of recitation in the face of condemnation by reformers and the failure of inquiry to win a commanding place in the classroom in spite of their support deserve serious thought. Does recitation have some positive evolutionary value, as Hoetker and Ahlbrand suggest? Such questions can be answered only by a much-more-thorough analysis of the classroom itself, both historically and at present. They again point to the need for a closer relationship between national reform and the schools and for reform measures based on a deeper and more-thorough understanding of school and classroom.

The Need for Historical Perspective

The social studies reform movements of the past two decades have been more cut off from their own past than have any other such major movements in the past century. There are many reasons for this unfortunate case of historical amnesia. One is a pervasive presentism in American society, greatly accentuated by the intense temporal focus on the present which is characteristic of television. The rise of the youth culture, characteristically focused on the present, is another. The powerful impact of the social sciences, which tend to be ahistorical, has played an important role. So has the retreat of the professional historians from any formal concern with the schools.

I hope that this paper has persuaded the reader of the importance of a historical perspective. I shall not argue this point further except to say that many current issues in social education, as well as other issues yet unrecognized, can be informed and illuminated by our past experience in dealing with them, by knowledge of their historical roots and of the controversies and changes they entailed. The past can never be a perfect or infallible guide to the present, but it can be much more of a guide than we have allowed it to be.

Current retrospectives of social studies education tend to begin with the mid-1950s, when the "new" curricular movements arose. That this time frame corresponds roughly with the adult life span of most of the investigators is probably not coincidental: it is their personally experienced historical reality. But the tendency is unfortunate, because taking that decade as the base line cuts us off from major, critical, and formative parts of our history, when many of the forces now affecting us took shape.

The opportunity to resuscitate the neglected history of the social studies lies before us, and the interest in doing so is growing. Histories of the social studies and of particular components, elements, or factors in their development are, like all history, dependent on the availability of sources. While for the social studies these sources are by no means complete (they never are), they are both numerous and rich. As new histories are attempted, new sources will be found. The problem is not the lack of sources but their multiplicity. What is needed is

not a few scattered studies but the development of a vigorous and continuing body of historical writing that will offer a variety of information about and interpretations of our past.

We need also to go beyond the history of national reform in our historical investigations. One way for reformers to obtain more systematic information about the school and classroom is to study the history of the social studies in a cross-section of local school systems. If we had a series of solid local historical studies, we would acquire a clearer picture of the connections between schools and national reform. Another line of investigation is suggested by the work of Hoetker and Ahlbrand cited above. Taking the system of observing classroom interaction developed by Arno Bellack of Teachers College, they applied it to historical observations of the classroom, with highly productive results.

The Need for a Comparative Perspective

In this study I have said little about developments in social studies education outside the United States. Nevertheless, I believe that we need a comparative international perspective on social studies education.

The AHA Committee of Seven, it will be remembered, began its investigation with a study of the teaching of history and allied subjects in European as well as American schools, and based its recommendations on promising European as well as American practices. Perhaps they felt the need for a comparative approach partly because they were attempting to establish history as a school subject. No doubt their choice of approach was also influenced by their own European training and by the then-widespread interest in comparative history. Since that time, only a relatively few American social studies educators, among them Henry Johnson, have written about the social studies outside the United States. Perhaps the fact that "the social studies" are an American invention has discouraged us from looking elsewhere.

For at least a century, Americans have been attempting an unprecedented task--to bring into the educational system the country's entire youthful population. With the exception of a small private sector, this

has been an effort under public control, undertaken at public expense. Today the elementary and secondary schools include virtually the entire population of the ages served. Similarly, the number and percentage of people who go on to higher education have increased enormously. The many difficult problems inherent in this experiment in mass education should not be allowed to detract from our recognition of its profound meaning and importance.

All countries shape their schools in markedly idealized versions of their own images and according to their own perceived needs--or the needs that their ruling powers deem essential. The social studies subjects are usually assigned an important role in this task. We should be much more aware than we are that other countries moving toward mass education are experiencing many of the problems that we face today and faced in the past. When we call for a global perspective in other matters, we should likewise apply this perspective to our educational system, especially the social studies. Doing so would enable us to draw on the relevant experiences of other countries as well as give us more confidence in what we ourselves are attempting to do and more pride and commitment in doing it. Such an assertion is always open to the charge of "ethnocentrism," but it is precisely educational ethnocentrism that seems to me to be part of our problem. Ethnocentrism limits one's perspective to one's own "group," and it may involve a negative as well as a positive assessment. That we do not see our own educational efforts in a broader international perspective has resulted, I believe, in a preoccupation with our shortcomings, problems, and failures without a balancing consideration of both the vastness of our effort and the extent to which it has succeeded. Freeing ourselves from this intense educational ethnocentrism will help us to deal with our problems with more equanimity and understanding.

The Social Studies in the Education of Citizens

Nothing is clearer in the history of social studies reform than the central role assigned to the social studies in the education of citizens. This has been both a mainstay and a source of many of our problems. The social studies cannot take a neutral position on the value

and worth of a democratic society, which presents its citizens with the obligation to criticize it as well as to cherish it. Nor can the social studies neglect either the history of this country or the knowledge and skills needed for students to participate effectively in a democratic political order. This is minimally the "knowledge of most worth" central to the social studies. The fact that American history, world or European history, and government/civics have continued to dominate the nation's secondary school social studies curriculum in spite of the indifference or opposition of many reformers and passing fashions and fads is due not simply to inertia, as some have argued, but to a recognition by schools of their centrality in the education of citizens. Although many other institutions, forces, and experiences educate, the only place where this "knowledge of most worth" will surely be offered is in our public schools, where a nation is continually being created out of a vast, complex, and "pluralistic" country.

The definition of the appropriate education of citizens has been one of the most vexing questions in social studies history. The opposing poles of this definition were early delineated between the Snedden and the Dewey versions of social efficiency. The former envisioned a static, hierarchical society in which everyone had a preordained place. The latter envisioned an open, changing society in which education enabled everyone to find their own places. On the whole, the social studies reformers have been closer to the Dewey than to the Snedden pole, but the argument has not ended, nor will it end. The fragmentation of social studies reform has opened the way, probably more than at any time in our history, to some of the contemporary versions of Sneddenism, which tend to be particularistic, vocational, anti-historical, utilitarian, and concerned with procedure at the expense of content.

One aspect of the education of citizens historically has been education about contemporary social problems, their place in the curriculum, and their relationship to history. Some reformers have attempted to base the social studies entirely on social problems, an approach that has not been widely accepted. The typical formulation seems to have been to teach history with some reference to present problems, to teach government or civics with some reference to societal functions, and to ensconce some form of POD in the 12th year, although not necessarily

under that label, or substitute one or more of the social sciences for POD. Neither the "new social studies" nor the personal/social problems social studies offered a specific way to integrate themselves into the curriculum scope and sequence, which remains an unresolved question.

Since the schools are public and societal institutions, they operate within public and societal constraints. The social studies curriculum, methods of teaching, and materials of instruction will continue to reflect this. In the teaching of controversial issues, limits of one kind or another are to be expected.

The question of advocacy or objectivity in the treatment of controversial issues has been debated time after time by social studies reformers. A few have advocated that the schools and the social studies devote themselves to reconstructing the social order, a position that has been largely rejected by the schools and by most reformers. But reformers have also opposed many of the attempts at censorship of textbooks and other attacks on academic freedom. Historically, the most typical reformer stance on the teaching of controversy has been to teach "both" (occasionally all) sides of an issue in a fair and balanced manner. Today teachers report an extraordinary freedom to deal with controversial issues, although they do not always exercise it. But the presentation of both--or all--sides in controversy among reformers themselves has not always been honored. The absence of sustained debate, for example, has been earlier noted in the discussion of many of the social studies issues in the past decade. Reform was thereby impoverished.

Student Learning

All the major committees and commissions dealt explicitly with how students learn. Both the Ten and the Seven drew on faculty psychology, albeit a loose version, in their belief in the transfer of learning. New theories about learning produced new curricular or methodological emphases. The movement for specific objectives was based on behaviorism. The 1916 NEA committee, basing its ideas on Dewey, asserted that social studies topics should be selected to match the present life interests of pupils or to assist them in their future growth. Many of

the citizenship and civics projects involved "learning by doing." Some curricula based on "the needs of adolescents," as in some versions of "core," threw overboard the subjects almost entirely. The "new social studies" and the personal/social problems social studies had their own conceptions of student learning, the first largely academic or "cognitive," the second largely affective--problem-oriented, personal, or "cultural."

Despite their many differences, including their brands of psychology, reformers have agreed on two matters. The first is that students learn better when they are actively involved in their own learning. The second is that many students dislike or are indifferent to the social studies subjects. There is substantial evidence supporting both hypotheses.

Students' complaints about the social studies are not new, but what is new is their willingness and opportunity to voice them. The situation suggests some lines of inquiry. Why do some students like social studies, and what are the characteristics of those students?

Why do students seem to like social studies better in elementary school than in secondary school? The current neglect of the social studies in the elementary school does not seem to be due to students. Their dislike of or indifference to the social studies seems to coincide roughly with the onset of adolescence. This is a time when one struggles with and finds a new identity, as Erikson and Piaget contended. It is characterized by some alienation from the past, by ambivalence toward or rejection of history, and by the acquisition of new temporal conceptions as an essential part of an evolving cognitive structure. I suggest that the nature of adolescent growth and change has implications for the teaching of history which have only begun to be explored: the study of history should help adolescents in this fundamental life process. If adolescent students are evolving a new relationship to society as part of a redefinition of themselves, should we not seek to identify ways in which the social studies can help them do it--not in superficial terms of "relevance," but in fundamental ways?[2]

The teaching of "concepts" is a favorite concern of social studies reformers, and "conceptual teaching" is frequently advocated. I have never been able to understand what nonconceptual teaching is, since I

think it is impossible to teach the social studies without concepts. Conceptual teaching seems often to mean teaching concepts with content used more or less illustratively. Whether or not one favors "conceptual teaching," it is important to know whether students can really learn the concepts that are plentifully presented in the social studies.

There is extensive literature, although little of recent origin, that links learning in the social studies with such fundamental concepts as time and space. I suggest that social studies educators revive the exploration of the relationship between such major concepts, or conceptions, and student development. Some British studies of student learning suggest that the capacity for abstract thought which accompanies adolescence may emerge later in history than in other subjects. These studies also suggest that students assume that the course of historical development took place in the same order that they encountered it in school. I draw these examples from the literature on history learning because I am familiar with it, but no doubt there is a similar literature on learning in the various other social studies.

The scope and sequence of the curriculum itself should be looked at from developmental viewpoints. The fragmentation and incoherence of the social studies presents students with an impossible task: to synthesize and make sense of this jumble at the very time in their lives when they are both resisting and trying to establish new connections and relations with the world about which we teach.

The Social Studies and the Disciplines

The argument over whether the social studies are a federation of subjects or a unitary field has divided reformers since the 1916 NEA report. In practice, federation has prevailed in the schools. The few exceptions are POD, some versions of civics, and some of the fused courses, mostly in the junior high school. The first two and many of the latter were also supported by the federationists. Source study and the "new social studies" are the clearest examples of federationist attempts to transfer the concerns of university scholars fairly intact to school classrooms. Essentially, these movements involved an argument over the purposes of the social studies. Seen in historical perspec-

tive, they were not in the main line of social studies development. Most federationists have argued for the basic citizenship-education purposes of the field while supporting the maintenance of the integrity of the individual subjects. In practice, this usually meant teaching history.

There are good practical reasons for the federationist position. The school subjects are derived from organized bodies of knowledge--the disciplines--which comprise cores of information, theory, interpretation, and methodologies which can be adapted for instructional purposes. The unitary-field advocates have no comparable basis on which they can build a curriculum. Despite heroic attempts to do so, they have not been able to detach the social studies from their parent disciplines. So resourceful, determined, and intelligent an enemy of the disciplines as Harold O. Rugg ended up with what was basically a history curriculum.

But if the unitarians have had their troubles, the path of the federationists has not been easy. The disciplines themselves change. Over the past century, they have sharpened their differences even while continuing to borrow freely across disciplinary boundaries, and they have also become internally much more fragmented and specialized. These changes have been reflected in the curriculum and in the materials of instruction. In history, for example, the process of specialization overwhelmed balancing efforts at synthesis. The fragmentation of historical research has produced much new knowledge, but its components have not yet been integrated. The problem goes beyond mere specialization. The belief in progress that undergirded most historical writing in the past century has been seriously eroded, and no new reformulation or organizing theme has yet replaced it. I suspect that a similar situation obtains in the other social sciences.

The natures of the disciplines and their relationships to each other have constituted one of the most persistent problems in social studies education. One of the contributions of the authors of the "new social studies" was their attempt to delineate the natures of the disciplines, although in my view they made the serious mistake of treating them as eternal rather than changing entities. They did not, however, similarly consider the relationships of the disciplines to each other. The last concerted attempt to examine with genuine sophistication and

depth both the disciplines and their mutual relationships was made by the AHA Commission on the Social Studies in the 1930s.

Both the federationists and the unitarians have a common interest in these matters. Because the federationists derive school subjects from the disciplines, they need to examine the disciplines. If all, or most, of the social sciences are to be included in the curriculum, their relationships have to be delineated. Similarly, if the unitarians wish to create a unitary discipline, which will inevitably be drawn largely from the social sciences--and probably the humanities as well--they also need to examine the natures and the relationships of the disciplines that will contribute to the creation of the field which they envision.

In both approaches, the problem of synthesis has been a persistent issue. The "new history," for example, was an attempt at historical synthesis which greatly influenced the social studies. Many of the difficulties of the core curriculum grew from the absence of a theoretical foundation that might have enabled subjects to be combined or fused more effectively. (Here I speak as a former core teacher of social studies and English who did not wish to throw the disciplines overboard.) Today I see a distinct movement toward synthesis in the form of general education in the schools and colleges. If I am correct, problems of synthesis will have to be directly addressed. Synthesis does not happen automatically. It is much easier to take things apart than to integrate them. Whether or not social studies reformers address themselves to the problem of synthesis, classroom teachers must do so, and it is insufficiently recognized that they are making the attempt with few models and little help. The writers of textbooks have a similar problem.

Thus, it seems to me that there are three issues in relation to the disciplines which should engage the attention of social studies reformers: (1) the natures of the several disciplines, (2) the natures of their relationships, and (3) the problem of synthesis, all considered in the context of the value and purposes of social studies education.

The Social Studies and the Learned Societies

Opponents of the disciplines point to the unsuitability of transferring the concerns of scholars virtually intact to the schools, though

this has rarely been advocated by reformers--the "new social studies" being a partial exception. The opponents rightly contend that university academics should not be encouraged or permitted to "tell the schools what to do" or to meddle where they have little or no experience, information, or competence. Nevertheless, the social studies need the disciplines.

For many years historians remained close to the schools; they were effective to the extent that they did so and also to the extent that they did not focus exclusively on history. I have tried to show that their participation helped to allay or prevent some of the worst abuses of social efficiency in the social studies. This relationship gradually cooled and became increasingly distant after World War II. Some of the social science professional organizations sponsored "new social studies" projects in the main disciplines. Their interest seems subsequently to have faded, along with project funding. Among historians there are a few mildly hopeful signs. A generation of historians has emerged which is deeply interested in teaching. These scholars have produced a literature that matches the social studies reform literature of the 1970s in its exuberance as well as its fragmentation. These teacher/historians, however, have little power in the profession. Whether there have been similar developments in the other social sciences, I do not know.[3]

The relationship of the social studies to the professional associations of the parent disciplines requires our urgent attention. We need the professional associations as partners, but they are not interested in the partnership. They do not understand the importance of the schools to their own professional health. The most hopeful development may be the growing interest in general education in the colleges, which could provide a basis for cooperation.

Curricular Scope and Sequence

Not since the beginning of the 1920s have social studies reformers attempted to suggest a scope and sequence for the social studies curriculum. The secondary curriculum today is still based fundamentally on the 1916 NEA report. No one really likes it very well, subsequent reformers have generally attacked it, but it endures.

Reformers have been reluctant to suggest an alternative. The usual reason given is that this should be left to the local districts. While I do not doubt the sincerity of these views, it is true that reformers have otherwise felt quite free to urge their ideas and their products on the schools. I suspect that an equally important although largely unspoken reason is that no one wants to take on so difficult a task. It's easier to leave it to the schools.

The situation has worsened in several respects, it seems to me, in terms of the 1916 NEA pattern. During the past two decades that pattern has been attacked both directly and indirectly in such a way as to vitiate the sense of purpose, the rationale for the curriculum itself which the pattern once possessed. The social sciences are now included in the curriculum much more extensively than they have been in the past, and the 1916 pattern cannot accommodate them very well.

Despite the charges that have been leveled against the 1916 report and the earlier reports as well, none of them sought to legislate a curriculum for the schools, nor did they have the power to impose one by fiat. They made recommendations which were clear, brief, and supported by persuasive rationales. The Ten, the Seven, and the 1916 report all offered some alternative patterns. The many detailed syllabi, courses, and textbooks that were based on the several reports were not included in the reports themselves.

Since every school must have a curriculum scope and sequence and many schools are currently revising their own, it would be useful if some models were developed which could aid them. These should be characterized by statements of purpose and by clarity, brevity, and flexibility. One might be based on the 1916 pattern itself, by examining it to see at least how the rationale for it could be reformulated. But we need alternative models as well. If these are to be genuinely useful to the schools, they cannot depart too far from current school practice. The example of the invention of POD and its widespread acceptance, however, shows that it is possible to evolve a "new" idea as part of a scope and sequence, provided that it corresponds to some important need in the schools.

Teachers today can often persuasively defend a course or unit they are teaching, but they find it very difficult to defend the social

studies curriculum as a whole to students, to school boards, to the general public, or to themselves. This is one of the major reasons why the social studies are in trouble in the schools and are so vulnerable to attack and erosion.

Dealing with the problem of scope and sequence seems to me much more important than contributing to the proliferation of new curriculum materials. We have a marvelous wealth of such materials already, and the problem is to choose among them and to fit them into a coherent curriculum structure.

For myself, I do not see any alternative to history and civics/government as the spine of the social studies curriculum. None of the other social studies subjects has the synthesizing and integrating power of history, nor can any of them provide the links with the past that seem to be so desperately needed. It would be folly, however, to ignore the influence and importance of the other social sciences, as some current advocates of a "return to history" seem eager to do. The case for civics/government seems to me self-evident if the historic role of the social studies in the education of citizens is to be maintained and developed.

The 1980s?

The basic lesson to be drawn from a history of social studies reform is the lesson that applies to all history--unless we study it we are doomed to repeat its mistakes. This maxim applies to social studies reform particularly, for two strangely contradictory reasons: first, the enormous wealth of relevant material on past movements and second, the stubborn refusal of successive waves of reformers, even the historians among them, to come to terms with this history before taking off on "new" reforms. Whatever the reasons for this obtuseness, we can no longer afford it.

At the opening of the 1980s several trends were curiously like those of the 1950s: concern with "the basics," attention to academically talented students, and demands for more and better mathematics, science, and foreign languages. Should these again coalesce into a movement for curriculum reform, the relationship of the social studies

to this development will depend not only on social studies educators' understanding of the past but also on their ability to assess the new conditions of the 1980s.

The 1980s will see deep changes in the human condition, some of them emerging from the past, some of them the results of new scientific, technological, and social phenomena. All of them will affect the social order and the kind of education it provides, including education in the social studies. We cannot predict the state of social studies a decade hence. We can only make informed guesses and express brave hopes based on known conditions to which social studies educators will have to react, actively or passively.

The first and most obvious condition is the aging of the American population, which, based as it is on long-term demographic trends, could be modified or reversed only slowly. The social studies were built on an expanding young population and on the expansion of the schools. We are already seeing the closing of schools on an unprecedented scale. Among the consequences of the present downward or stable demographic trend in the school population will be the necessity of justifying the social studies to an aging taxpaying public. It will also probably mean reduced educational support generally and fewer jobs and less mobility for social studies teachers. However, an aging population is likely to be more historically minded, just because they have themselves experienced historical change. This may mean more support for history.

The second condition is the chronic "stagflation" in the economy, which shows few signs of disappearing in the near future. This will mean less money in school budgets for expensive "innovations" and will probably result in greater reliance on textbooks as the major medium of instruction. Along with creating greater pressures for accountability, economic constraints will force the social studies to fight harder to justify their place in the curriculum.

The third condition is the pervasive influence of television and electronic gadgetry in general. The influence of TV has received only passing attention from social studies reformers. Few curricula deal analytically or critically with TV: it is simply regarded as another useful audiovisual facility. We know very little about TV's specific impact on social studies learning in the secondary schools, including

the models of citizenship behavior that it offers the young. We need to know more, and so do our students. A similar situation obtains with the growing use of computers in instruction.

The fourth and most basic condition is the coming transformation of the United States from an economy based on the expectation of an endless supply of natural resources to one based on the recognition of limited resources, especially energy. This seems to me to imply a transformation comparable to the industrial revolution. The social studies should not only deal with this historically, they should help students examine what this transformation implies for changes in their own values and attitudes and in their relationships with society.

All of these trends--and others--are related to our faltering but still living belief in progress and its inevitability. The social studies and their parent disciplines have historically been based on this belief. It has been held by both critics and defenders of the status quo. Reform itself is based on belief in progress, for without confidence in the future and in the possibility of affecting change for the better, reformers would not be in business at all.

Today the belief in inevitable progress is diminishing. People are less confident that their future or their children's future will be better than the present. Nor do they have much confidence in their ability to do anything about it. They are shaken in their once overwhelming faith in the blessings of science and technology. And basic societal institutions--the family and the church, for example--no longer offer assurance of continuity.

Yet I believe that the idea of progress cannot be extinguished. Even now it is being reformulated in the light of different expectations about the future. Progress will be seen more in terms of improving the quality of life in a stable society, less in terms of piling up possessions in an ever-expanding economy. Expectations of immediate gains will be modified to accommodate continuing long-term hopes. Such a view of progress is not at all unusual in our history. In any case, the idea itself is so deeply ingrained in the American people that we are much more likely to reformulate what progress means than to give up our belief in it. Whether or not I am right, there is little question of the importance of the idea of progress in the social studies. Indeed,

social studies reformers should take a lead in the reformulation which I believe is even now under way.

If there is any definite, identifiable trend in social studies reform as the 1980s open, it is, I believe, a search for coherence. This is a reflection of the intense yearning in the larger society for understandable explanations of the perplexities of the 1970s. In the colleges, it is taking the form of an increased interest in general education for citizens as a necessary foundation for both informed civic participation and further specialization. The experiments in a "core" curriculum at Harvard and Stanford are examples. So is the renewed consideration of the introductory survey courses. In the schools, mini-courses have been discarded and districts are reviewing their curricula with a view to greater coherence. There is a distinct and renewed interest in citizenship education and in history. Whether these trends will continue, it is too early to say. Similar developments after World War I and World War II had markedly different results. In the past the college and the school have so deeply influenced each other that there is little reason to assume a change in that historic linkage. If I am right in my view that the search for coherence is the trend most evident in social studies reform today, we can find much guidance in the past as to how to deal with it productively.

But the past will not be enough. It can guide but it cannot dictate. This is also a lesson of history.

References

1. James E. Hoetker and William Ahlbrand, Jr., "The Persistence of the Recitation," AERA Journal 6 (March 1969), pp. 145-167.

2. See Hazel W. Hertzberg, "Alienation From the Past: Time, Adolescence, and History" (paper presented at the Teachers College Conference on History in the Schools, 1977).

3. See Hazel Whitman Hertzberg, "The Teaching of History," in Michael Kammen, ed., The Past Before Us: Contemporary Historical Writing in the United States (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980).

NAME INDEX

Adams, Charles Kendall, 9
Adams, Herbert Baxter, 7, 12
Ahlbrand, William, Jr., 168, 170
Alexander, Thomas, 48
Andrews, Charles McLean, 21

Bagley, William C., 48
Ballou, Frank, 52
Banks, James A., 123, 147, 149
Beale, Howard K., 48
Beard, Charles A., 1, 18, 21, 44, 45-47, 52, 87, 145
Becker, James M., 116, 138
Bellack, Arno, 170
Bemis, Samuel Flagg, 92
Bestor, Arthur, 89-92, 94
Berelson, Bernard, 95-96
Billington, Ray S., 92
Blynn, Theodore C., 68
Bode, Boyd H., 53
Bowman, Isaiah, 48, 52
Brinton, Crane, 92
Bruner, Jerome; Brunerian, 51, 97, 99, 101, 104, 105
Buck, Solon J., 92

Cartwright, William H., 94, 114
Collier, Malcolm, 102
Cortes, Carlos E., 149
Counts, George S., 47-48, 50, 52, 56
Cuban, Larry, 118
Current, Richard N., 92
Curti, Merle, 47-48

Davis, O.L., Jr., 157
Dawson, Edgar, 36, 37
Day, Edmund E., 52, 56
Dewey, John; Deweyan, 17-18, 27, 30, 44, 45, 48, 57, 59, 78, 101, 134, 172, 173
Diamond, Stanley, 77
DuBois, W.E.B., 123
Dunn, Arthur W, .25-26

Eisenhower, Dwight D.,78, 98
Eliot, Charles, 9
Ely, Richard T., 7, 8
Engle, Shirley H., 104-105, 107
Erikson, Erik, 174

Feldmesser, Robert C., 102
Fenton, Edwin, 101, 108-109, 113, 116, 124, 140, 141
Fine, Benjamin, 69
Finney, Ross L., 34, 36
FitzGerald, Frances, 146-47
Fling, Fred Morrow, 15
Ford, Guy Stanton, 68
Fox, George L., 12
Fraenkel, Jack R., 140-41
Fraser, Dorothy M., 109-110
Fraser, Hugh R., 69
Friedel, Frank, 92

Gambrill, J. Montgomery, 37-40
Gay, Geneva, 150
Gibson, Emily, 123
Gillespie, Judith A., 129-130
Goetz, Rachel Marshall ,48
Good, John M., 108-109, 113, 116
Gross, Richard E., 113-14, 155-57, 159, 161-62

Hacker, Louis M., 92
Hall, G. Stanley, 7
Halsey, Van R., 101
Hanna, Paul R., 105-106
Hare, Nathan, 123
Harlan, Louis R, .124

Hart, Albert Bushnell, 9, 12
Haskins, Charles Homer ,12
Hayes, Carleton J.H., 92
Helburn, Suzanne Wiggins, 108, 157
Hertzberg, Hazel W., 125-26
Hitler, Adolph, 75
Hocking, William Ernest, 92
Hoetker, James E., 168, 170
Hofstadter, Richard, 92, 146
Holt, W. Stull, 92
Horn, Ernest, 43, 44, 48, 52
Hunt, Erling, 54, 67, 69, 74

Jarolimek, John, 151-53
Jennings, M. Kent, 128
Johnson, Earl, 94
Johnson, Henry, 20, 43-44, 48, 69, 81-82, 170
Jones, Howard Mumford, 92
Jones, Thomas Jesse, 25

Kallen, Horace, 75
Kaltsounis, Theodore, 149-150
Keller, Charles R., 99, 101
Kelley, Truman, 48
Kennedy, John F., 98
Kimmel, W.G., 44
King, Martin Luther, Jr., 121, 124
Kirkendall, Richard S., 153, 154
Knopf, Alfred, 92
Kohlberg, Lawrence, 140
Kownslar, Allan O., 145
Krey, A.C., 43, 44, 48, 52, 58
Krutch, Joseph Wood, 92

Marshall, George C., 78
Marshall, Leon C., 34, 36, 37, 43, 44, 48
Massialas, Byron A., 105, 113
McCutchen, Samuel P., 103-104
McKinley, Albert, 20, 36, 54
McLaughlin, Andrew C., 12
Mehlinger, Howard D., 129-130, 141-42
Mendenhall, Thomas C., 106-107
Merriam, Charles E., 43, 48, 52
Metcalf, Lawrence E., 105
Michaelis, John U., 108
Michener, James A., 58
Morrison, Samuel Eliot, 124
Morrissett, Irving, 108, 137
Murra, Wilbur M., 54

Nevins, Allan, 67, 92
Newlon, Jesse, 43, 47
Newmann, Fred M., 113

Oliver, Donald, 101
Olsen, Carl O., Jr., 114

Patrick, John J., 127-28
Peyre, Henri, 92
Piaget, Jean, 174
Pierce, Bessie L., 48, 55
Price, Roy A., 93

Quillen, I. James, 60

Reinsch, Paul S., 20
Robey, Ralph W., 66
Robinson, James Harvey, 1, 9, 18, 21, 25, 27, 30, 44, 45
Ross, Edward A., 17
Rugg, Earl, 36
Rugg, Harold O., 66, 176
Russell, William R., 78

Salmon, Lucy M., 12, 13
Sanders, Nelson M., 137
Schafer, Joseph, 30
Schafer, W.A., 20
Senesh, Lawrence, 101, 108
Shaver, James P., 141, 142, 157
Simon, Sidney B., 131
Small, Albion, 21
Snedden, David; Sneddenist, 17, 18, 28, 29, 59, 86, 172
Spencer, Herbert, 11, 17
Sperling, John G., 108
Stavrianos, L.S., 108
Stephens, H. Morse, 12
Stevenson, Adlai, 98
Sumner, Charles, 8

Taba, Hilda, 74
Tanck, Marion L., 137
Todd, Lewis Paul, 96
Tryon, Rollo M., 48, 81-82
Turner, Frederick Jackson, 18

Van Tils, William, 74
Viereck, Peter, 92

Washington, Booker T., 124
Washington, George, 16, 123
Watson, Richard L., Jr., 94
Wesley, Edgar B., 1-3, 67-69, 73
Wiggins, Suzanne E.: see Helburn, Suzanne Wiggins
Wiley, Karen, 137

Wilson, Howard E., 55, 60
Wilson, Woodrow, 9

X, Malcolm, 123

Youngblood, Chester A., 149, 150

Zeleny, Leslie D., 73

SUBJECT INDEX

Academic freedom, 48, 56, 66-67, 71, 141, 159, 162, 173
Accountability, 130, 181
Administrators (school)
  attitudes of, 37
  perceptions of, 118, 160, 161
Africa (study of), 51, 130
American Anthropological Association (AAA), 20, 102
American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), 97
American Association of School Administrators (AASA), 44, 56
American Association of Teachers Colleges (AATC), 33
American Bar Association (ABA), 35, 139
  Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship, 139
American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS), 95-96
American Economic Association (AEA), 7-8, 11, 34, 43, 72
American Herbartians, 21
American Historical Association (AHA), 6-8, 12, 16, 20, 21, 30-32, 39, 40, 43-54, 57, 58, 65, 67-69, 71, 72, 89, 92, 154
  Commission on the Social Studies, 43-53, 56, 58, 60, 65-66, 72, 73, 81, 91, 96, 166, 177
  Committee of Eight (1909), 16, 21, 31
  Committee of Eight (1918), 30-32
  Committee of Five, 21, 25
  Committee of Seven, 12-17, 19, 21, 22, 31, 37, 44, 59-60, 166-67, 170, 173, 179
  Committee on American History in the Schools and Colleges, 68-69
  "History Inquiry," 37, 40
  History Ten (of NEA Committee of Ten), 9-12, 15-16, 17, 18, 44, 55, 59-60, 166, 167, 173, 179
  Service Center for Teachers of History, 93, 100
American Historical Review (AHR), 71
American history: see History
American Indians (study of), 125, 134
American Placement Program, 99
American Political Science Association (APSA), 20, 34, 43, 54, 72, 128-29
  Committee of Five, 20-21
  Committee on the Social Studies, 72
American Social Science Association (ASSA), 6-7
American Sociological Association (ASA); originally American Sociological Society, 20, 34, 73, 102
  Committee on Sociology in the Secondary Schools, 73
American Sociological Society (ASS), 20, 21, 54
Amherst (College) (project), 101, 108, 138
Analysis of Public Issues (project), 138
Ancient history: see History
Anglo Americans: see WASPs
Anthropologists, 20-21, 102
Anthropology (as school subject)
  enrollments in, 156
  in relation to other subjects, 107
  in social studies curriculum, 2, 21, 95, 102-103, 107, 110
Anthropology Curriculum Study Project, 102, 116, 138
Area studies, 79, 89, 109, 114, 130, 137, 156
Asia (study of), 51, 108, 130
Asians: see Orientals

Association of American Geographers (AAG), 102
Association of History Teachers of the Middle States and Maryland; Middle States Association, 19, 36

Back-to-basics movement: also see Skills, basic, 2, 139, 158, 180
Beard Commission: see American Historical Association, Commission on the Social Studies
Black studies, 110, 123-26, 130, 145, 147
Blacks: see Negroes
Block-time approach, 80-81, 110
"Brown Boxes," 78, 116
Bureau of Education, U.S, .57
Bureau of Intercultural Education, U.S., 74

California, University of (Berkeley), 30
Career education, 139, 140, 154
Carnegie Corporation, 44, 54, 78-79, 97
Carnegie-Mellon University
  Slow Learner Project, 138
  Social Studies Curriculum Project, 101, 116
Certification (of teachers): see Teacher education
Chicanos: see Mexican Americans
Citizenship education, 10, 11, 13, 16, 17, 26-29, 35, 38-39, 45, 48, 55-57, 67, 70, 72, 74-79, 85, 90, 93, 95-99, 101, 107-109, 112-113, 116, 126-130, 139-142, 153, 158, 167, 171-73, 174, 176, 180, 183
Citizenship Education Project: see Teachers College
Civics (as school subject): also see Government; Community civics
  enrollments in, 57, 155-56
  in relation to other subjects, 2, 21, 27, 28, 31, 34, 46, 74
  in social studies curriculum, 1, 2, 16, 20, 21, 27, 28, 34, 46, 48, 57, 58, 74, 94, 107, 110, 127-28, 134, 155, 161, 174, 175, 180
  nature/structure of, 34, 112
Civil government: see Government
Civil War; Reconstruction, 3
Classics (as school subjects), 3, 6, 9, 33
Colleges: see Higher education
Colorado, University of, 138
Columbia University: also see Teachers College, 18, 20, 30, 32, 36, 76, 121, 146, 167
Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education (NEA): see National Education Association
Commission on the Social Studies (AHA): see American Historical Association
Committee for Economic Development, 72
Committee of Eight (AHA): see American Historical Association
Committee of Five (AHA): see American Historical Association
Committee of Five (APSA): see American Political Science Association
Committee of Seven (AHA): see American Historical Association
Committee of Ten (NEA): see National Education Association
Committee on American History in the Schools and Colleges (AHA/MVHA/NCSS): see American Historical Association; Mississippi Valley Historical Association; National Council for the Social Studies
Committee on History and Education for Citizenship (AHA): see American Historical Association, Committee of Eight (1918)
Committee on Sociology in the Secondary Schools (ASA): see American Sociological Association
Committee on the Function of the Social Studies in General Education (PEA): see Progressive Education Association
Committee on the Social Studies (APSA): see American Political Science Association
Committee on the Social Studies (NEA): see National Education Association
Commonwealth Fund, 37
Community (school involvement with), 38, 78-79, 129, 167
Community civics (as school subject): also see Civics; Community studies, 22, 25-27, 31, 32, 38, 56-58
Community studies, 31, 38, 58, 79, 145
Concepts; conceptual framework, 3, 86, 99, 104, 107, 110, 112, 114, 115, 127, 130, 131, 141, 146, 154, 157, 174-75

Conference on History, Civil Government, and Political Economy: see American Historical Association, History Ten
Consensus history, 87-89, 145
Consumer education, 139, 140, 154
"Contemporary Civilization" (course), 30
Core curriculum, 2, 57, 58, 61, 79-81, 85, 174, 177, 183
Cornell University, 5
Council for Basic Education, 92
Critical thinking: see Teaching methods
Criticisms (of schools); critics, 66-69, 85-86, 89-93, 94, 97, 98, 105, 113-14, 118, 134, 141, 146-47, 153
Cultural pluralism, 75, 95, 125, 135, 147, 148, 149, 152
Curriculum
  development (growth of field), 33, 48
  materials, 15, 28, 32, 38, 52, 86-87, 114, 173, 180
    produced by national projects, 97-98, 109, 111, 115-17, 136-38, 162
    produced by regional teachers' associations, 19-20
    textbooks, 10, 38, 66, 68, 124, 146-47, 158, 177
  patterns, 1, 4, 16, 35, 37-39, 55-58, 70, 76, 79-81, 103, 109-111, 115, 134, 154-162, 165-66, 172, 179
  recommendations, 10-11, 14-16, 20-21, 22, 26-29, 31, 34, 45-53, 57-58, 59-61, 70-71, 74-77, 89-96, 99, 103-107, 127-28, 132-36, 152-53, 179
Curriculum Materials Analysis System (CMAS), 137

Detroit Citizenship Education Project, 77, 79
Disciplines (social science): see Social sciences; also see individual disciplines
Discovery method: see Teaching methods, inquiry

Economic conditions (influence of on education): 44-45, 49-50, 181, 182
Economics (as school subject)
  enrollments in, 4, 57, 156
  in relation to other subjects, 2, 11-12, 30, 34
  in social studies curriculum, 1, 2, 4, 11, 12, 34, 51, 58, 72-73, 79, 94, 95, 101, 103, 106, 108, 110, 134
  nature/structure of, 11, 35
Economists; economic theories
  institutional, 7-8, 12
  neoclassical; laissez-faire, 8, 12, 35, 47, 50, 52
  professional associations, 7-8, 11-12, 34, 72-73
Educational Policies Commission, 56-57
Eight-Year Study (PEA): see Progressive Education Association
Electronics; television (influence of on education), 181-82
Elementary schools: see Schools
Elkhart (Indiana) schools, 101
Energy education, 140, 153
England (education in), 13, 48
English history: see History
Environmental studies, 130, 140
Ethnic studies; intercultural education; multiethnic/multicultural education, 75, 125-26, 130, 137, 145, 147-153, 156-57
Ethnocentrism, 149, 171
Europe (education in): also see individual countries, 4-5, 13, 48, 85-86, 166, 170
Evaluation: see Testing
Expanding-environments pattern, 106

Ford Foundation, 102
France (education in), 13, 48, 78
Fund for the Advancement of Education: see Ford Foundation

Games: see Teaching methods
General history: see History
Geographers, 101-102
Geography (as school subject)
  enrollments in, 156
  in relation to other subjects, 3, 11, 31, 48
  in social studies curriculum, 2, 27, 51, 58, 95, 101-103, 106, 108, 110, 134, 158, 161
Germans, 29, 74
Germany (education in), 5-7, 13, 15, 48
Global perspective(s); international relations, 28, 31, 49-50, 74-75, 78, 79, 94, 108, 140, 153, 171
Goals (of education): also see Role of schools, 13, 26, 28-29, 45, 50, 56-57, 70, 89-90, 158

Government, U.S. (as school subject); civil government
enrollments in, 4, 57, 155-56, 158, 172
in relation to other subjects, 2, 3, 11, 13, 21, 28, 30
in social studies curriculum, 1, 4, 10, 11, 13, 14, 20, 21, 22, 34, 51, 58, 94, 107, 110, 128, 129, 134, 137, 158, 180
Greater Cleveland Social Science Program, 108

Hampton Institute, 25
Harvard University, 5, 9, 76, 101, 183
Harvard Project, 101, 116
High School Geography Project, 101, 108, 133
Higher education: also see Teacher education
conflicts within, 6
course offerings, 30, 32, 67, 70, 71, 76-77, 87, 154
growth and change, in U.S., 4-5, 33, 87, 177, 183
influence of, on precollege curriculum, 5, 21
requirements
entrance, 5, 9, 10, 12, 13, 25, 67
graduation, 67
students, 69
teachers, 71
Hispanic Americans: also see Mexican Americans; Puerto Ricans, 125, 148, 153
Historians, 5, 12-16, 21, 29, 40, 43, 65-73, 88, 89, 92, 94, 99-100, 178
interest in schools, 8-16, 19, 20-22, 30-32, 35, 43-53, 55, 65-73, 82, 88, 89, 91-93, 154, 169, 178
professional associations, 6-7, 8, 12, 54, 65-72, 91, 100, 154
regional teachers' associations, 19-21, 25, 26, 28, 30, 36-37, 39, 44
Historical Outlook, The; formerly History Teachers Magazine, 29, 32, 36, 53, 55
History (as school subject)
American history
enrollments in, 4, 57, 70, 155-56
in relation to other subjects, 3, 19, 21, 28, 68, 71
in social studies curriculum, 1, 2, 4, 10, 14, 16, 27, 28, 29, 57, 58, 66-72, 95, 99, 106, 108, 110, 142, 145-47, 153-55, 156, 158, 161, 170, 172, 180, 183
nature/structure of, 1, 2, 87-89, 145
ancient history
enrollments in, 4, 57
in social studies curriculum, 4, 10, 14, 16, 18, 22, 27, 28, 29, 58
English history
enrollments in, 4, 57
in social studies curriculum, 4, 10, 14, 16, 27, 29, 33
European history
enrollments in, 57
in social studies curriculum, 14, 27, 28, 29, 31, 38, 58, 110
general history
enrollments in, 4
in social studies curriculum, 4, 10, 16
local history, 16, 145
medieval history
enrollments in, 4, 57
in social studies curriculum, 4, 10, 14, 16, 58
modern history
enrollments in, 4, 57
in social studies curriculum, 4, 10, 14, 16, 28, 29, 38, 58, 110
oral history, 145
"Outlines of History," 4
state history, 4, 161
"Universal History," 4
world history
enrollments in, 57, 155-56
in social studies curriculum, 31-32, 38, 58, 106, 108, 110, 161, 172
"History Inquiry" (AHA): see American Historical Association
History of the social studies: see Social studies
History Teacher, The, 154
History teachers' associations: see Historians, regional teachers' associations
History Teachers Magazine, The (HTM), 20, 22, 26, 29, 71
History Ten: see American Historical Association
Human-relations training, 74-75, 79
Hunter College, 109-110

Immigration; immigrants, 3, 75-76, 89, 146, 151-52
Independent study: see Teaching methods
Indiana University, 130
Individualized instruction: see Teaching methods
Indoctrination: see Socialization
Inquiry method: see Teaching methods
Institutional economics: see Economists
Intercultural education: see Ethnic studies
International relations: see Global perspective(s)

Japanese Americans: also see Orientals, 74
Jews, 74
John Hays Fellows Program, 99
Johns Hopkins University, 5, 7
Joint Council on Economic Education (JCEE), 72-73
Junior high schools: see Schools

Krey Commission: see American Historical Association, Commission on the Social Studies

Laissez-faire economics: see Economists, neoclassical
Latin America (study of), 51, 58, 106
Law-related education, 137, 139-140, 156
League of Nations, 74
Learned societies: see Professional social science associations
Learning theories, 39, 173-175
Lecture method: see Teaching methods
Life-adjustment curriculum, 2, 81, 87, 88, 91, 92
Life-interests approach: see Student-centered curriculum
Lincoln-Filene Center for Citizenship and Public Affairs: see Tufts University
Lincoln School: see Teachers College
Local history: see History; Community studies

Man: A Course of Study (MACOS), 108
Marxists (influence of), 47, 145
Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs: see Syracuse University
McKinley Publishing Company, 54
Medieval history: see History
Melting pot (concept), 75-76, 126, 145, 147-48, 151
Mexican Americans; Chicanos: also see Hispanic Americans, 74, 134, 149, 150, 153
Middle States Association: see Association of History Teachers of the Middle States and Maryland
Mini-courses, 134, 157, 159, 183
Minnesota Project Social Studies, 138
Minnesota, University of, 20
Minority studies: also see Ethnic studies, 123-26, 130, 147
Mississippi Valley Historical Association, 18, 65, 67-69, 71
  Committee on American History in the the Schools and Colleges, 68-69
Mississippi Valley Historical Review, 67, 71
Modern history: see History
Moral development: also see Values education, 92, 94, 140, 141
Morrill Act, 5
Multiethnic/multicultural education: see Ethnic studies

National Academy of Sciences, 97
National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 166
National Association of Manufacturers (NAM), 66
National Board for Historical Service, 29, 30
National Conference of Christians and Jews, 74
National Council for Geographic Education (NCGE), 102
National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS), 35-40, 43, 44, 53-55, 58-61, 65-69, 71-75, 77, 92-96, 98, 103, 108, 110, 132-38, 141-42, 145, 152, 157-162
  bulletins, 55, 71
  Committee on Academic Freedom, 66
  Committee on American History in the Schools and Colleges, 68-69
  curriculum guidelines (1971), 132-38
  curriculum guidelines (1979), 152
  review of NSF survey (1979), 158-62
  yearbooks, 55, 71, 74, 75, 93-95, 145
National Education Association (NEA), 1, 4, 8-13, 15-18, 25-33, 35-37, 39,

43, 44, 55-60, 66, 91, 96, 99, 103, 107, 108, 112, 115, 155, 166, 167, 173, 175, 178-79
Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education (CRSE), 25, 28-30
Committee of Ten, 8-13, 15-18, 25-29, 44, 55, 59-60, 166, 167, 173, 179
Committee on the Social Studies (1916), 1, 4, 9, 17, 25-31, 35-37, 44, 58, 60, 91, 96, 99, 103, 107, 108, 112, 115
National Recovery Act (NRA), 49
National Science Foundation (NSF), 86, 97, 102, 108, 157, 159-62
1976 national survey, 157, 159-162
Native Americans: see American Indians
Nazism, 74
Nebraska, University of, 15
Negroes; blacks (in America): also see Black studies, 74, 79, 116, 118, 123-26, 127, 134, 145, 149, 150, 151
Neoclassical economics: see Economists
Network News Exchange, 154
"New civics," 22
New Deal, 46, 49
New England History Teachers Association, 19
"New historians"; progressive historians, 1, 18-19, 21, 44, 87-88, 146
"New history," 1, 17, 18-19, 21, 22, 25, 27, 28, 43, 87-89, 177
New Left (influence of), 122, 145
"New social studies," 3, 85, 87, 92, 95, 101-118, 127, 130-32, 135-38, 141, 145, 146, 157, 162, 166, 167, 174, 175, 178
New York Times, 67, 68
New York University, 72
1916 committee; 1916 report: see National Education Association, Committee on the Social Studies (1916)
1976 national survey: see National Science Foundation
North Central History Teachers Association, 19
Northwestern University, 108

Objectives (learning), 17, 18, 33, 39, 43, 45-47, 48, 130, 131, 173, 174
Office of Education, U.S, .69, 97, 103, 108, 109
Ohio University, 138
Oral history: see History
Organization of American Historians, 19, 154
Orientals, 125, 134
Our Working World (project), 108, 138
"Outlines of History" (course): see History

Pennsylvania, University of, 20
Pittsburgh schools, 101
Poles, 74
Political science (as school subject): also see Civics; Government, 2, 140, 153
in relation to other subjects, 74
in social studies curriculum, 2, 11, 34, 74, 106, 110, 113, 134, 137
nature/structure of, 2, 35
Political scientists, 20-21, 34-35
professional associations, 20-21, 34, 72, 100
Population Council, 95
Population studies, 130, 140
Presentism, 14, 134, 169
President's Commission on Higher Education ,76
Primary grades: see Schools, elementary
Primary sources: see Teaching methods, source study
Princeton University, 9, 52
Private education (in United States), 4, 5, 6, 57, 80, 170
"Problems of Democracy" (course): also see Social problems, 27, 28, 34, 57, 58, 107, 155-56, 172-73, 175, 179
"Problems of Society" (course): also see Social problems, 106
Problem solving: see Teaching methods, critical thinking
Professional social science associations: also see individual disciplines, 3, 6-8, 19-22, 32-35, 37, 39, 44, 65-73, 74, 95, 178
Progressive Education Association (PEA), 57, 59-61, 80, 103
Committee on the Functions of the Social Studies in General Education, 59-61
Eight-Year Study, 57, 80
Progressive historians: see "New historians"
Progressive period; progressivism, 1, 17-19, 21, 22, 29, 87, 88-89, 146

Project Social Studies, 103, 108, 113
Projects (national curriculum): also see "New social studies," 86-87, 96-99, 100-103, 108-109, 111, 113, 114, 115, 131, 136-38, 162, 167
Psychology (as school subject)
  enrollments in, 156
  social studies curriculum, 2, 95, 110, 134
Public education (in United States): also see Schools, 3-6, 33, 57, 89-90, 170-173
Puerto Ricans: also see Hispanic Americans, 134
Purdue University, 101

Rand Corporation, 97
Recitation method: see Teaching methods
Reconstruction: see Civil War
"Redbook" (Harvard Report), 76
Rockefeller Foundation, 68
Role of schools: also see Goals, 3, 5-6, 9, 11, 13, 45, 47, 56-57, 135, 158, 159, 166

Schafer Committee: see American Historical Association, Committee of Eight (1918)
Schools (in United States): also see Higher education; Public education; Teacher education; also see individual subjects
  elementary schools
    curriculum patterns, 10, 11, 16, 21, 26, 30-31, 32, 37, 58, 70, 94, 106, 110, 137, 139, 155, 174
    enrollments, 155, 171
  junior high schools
    curriculum patterns, 2, 22, 27, 31-32, 34, 37, 39, 58, 61, 70, 80, 110, 137, 175
    social studies requirements, 161
  senior high schools
    curriculum patterns, 3-6, 9-11, 13, 16, 19, 22, 26, 27, 28-29, 31, 34, 37, 57, 58, 70, 77-78, 80, 90, 94, 96, 106, 110, 137, 139, 155-56, 161, 178-79
    enrollments, 4, 33, 155-56, 171
    social studies requirements, 16, 156, 161
Scope and sequence: also see Curriculum recommendations
  lack of, in recommendations, 51, 53, 57, 59, 66, 81, 105-106, 107, 153, 160, 166, 178
  recommendations for, 2, 3, 53, 61, 80, 81, 90-91, 93, 98, 106, 109, 112, 112, 131, 135, 141, 162, 173, 175, 179-180
Secondary schools: see Schools, senior high schools
Self-concept, 123-24, 145, 147, 150
Self-realization (approach), 122, 131, 139, 146, 166
Senior high schools: see Schools
Service Center for Teachers of History (AHA): see American Historical Association
Seven cardinal principles (from 1916 NEA report), 28-29
Sexism (as social problem), 153
Simulations: see Teaching methods, games and simulations
Skills, 71, 78
  basic, 28, 153
Smith College, 7, 106
Social control, 1, 17, 29, 34, 36, 39, 47, 48, 52
Social Education, 20, 54, 55, 65, 67, 69, 72, 73, 76, 79, 96, 104, 108, 111, 113, 115, 118, 123, 125-28, 136-38, 140, 146, 149-153, 155, 158
Social efficiency, 1, 17, 18, 26, 29, 33, 36, 39, 45, 52, 57, 59, 86, 172, 178
Social history: see "New history"
Socialization; indoctrination, 17-18, 45, 46, 47, 52, 55, 56, 104, 105, 127, 131, 135, 158, 159, 166
Social problems (approach); social issues, 28-29, 37, 45, 52, 61, 77, 79, 104, 106, 109, 114, 122-23, 130-35, 137, 139, 145-47, 153, 158, 160, 166, 172-74
Social Science Education Consortium, 108, 137
Social Science Research Council, 43
Social sciences: also see individual disciplines
  in relation to social studies curriculum, 2-3, 14-15, 19, 28, 32, 34-35, 37, 38, 40, 45-46, 48-49, 55, 71-73, 86-87, 90-93, 95, 97-118, 127, 128, 131, 141, 153, 169, 176, 178-79, 180
  relationships among, 2-3, 7, 30, 34-35,

45, 46, 48, 90, 106, 107, 109, 114, 153, 176-77
structures of, 35, 46, 49, 86, 89, 90, 93, 97, 99, 102, 105, 107, 108, 111-15, 121, 132, 134-35, 176-77
Social studies: also see individual subjects
as a federation of social science disciplines, 1-3, 26, 34-35, 37, 45, 55, 86, 95, 96, 99, 103-104, 107, 175-77
as a separate "discipline," 103-104
as a unitary (fused) field, 2, 3, 26, 37, 38, 55, 57, 61, 79-81, 176-77
debates over nature of, 1-3, 26, 34-35, 45, 46, 55, 61, 95, 103-107, 127, 132, 153, 175-77
definitions of (term), 1-3, 26, 37, 90, 99, 108
history of (attention to), 81-82, 91-92, 96, 111-12, 116, 129-30, 146-47, 169-170, 172, 180-83
origins of, 1, 17
Social Studies, The, 54
Social Studies Development Center, 130
Society for History Education, 154
Sociological Resources for the Secondary School (project), 102
Sociologists, 11, 21, 34-35, 73
professional associations, 20-21, 34-35, 73, 102
Sociology (as school subject)
enrollments in, 57, 156
in relation to other subjects, 2, 11-12
in social studies curriculum, 1, 2, 11, 21, 34, 51, 58, 94, 95, 102-103, 110, 134
nature/structure of, 11, 35
Source-study method: see Teaching methods
Soviet Union: see USSR
Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship: see American Bar Association
Sputnik, 87, 97
Stanford University, 183
State history: see History
Structure (of discipline): see Social sciences; also see individual disciplines
Student-centered curriculum, 2, 27, 28, 38, 51, 55, 56, 59, 61, 80-81, 130-32, 173
Students
attitudes of, 77, 95, 97, 122, 127-29, 137, 154, 158, 160, 174
characteristics of, 2, 117, 122, 127
gifted and talented, 60-61, 79, 86, 90, 93, 94, 98, 101, 113, 114, 180
less able, 61, 79, 90, 93, 109, 113, 117
perceptions of, 122
performance of, 69
Teacher education; teacher preparation, 10, 11, 13, 15, 20, 21, 22, 28, 33, 43, 48, 51, 68, 71, 79, 85, 87, 91, 93, 94, 98, 107, 136, 140
certification, 22, 26, 91, 93, 94, 98, 154
Teachers
attitudes of, 60, 122, 158-59, 168
attitudes toward, 117, 141
behavior of, 122, 159, 173
characteristics of, 48, 68, 116-17
demands on, 113, 141, 159, 177
perceptions of, 112, 118, 160, 161
Teachers College (Columbia University), 36, 37, 43, 47, 54, 69, 78-79, 89, 111, 167, 170
Citizenship Education Project, 78-79, 116, 167
Lincoln School, 89
Teaching methods, 7, 10, 15, 48, 51, 59, 94, 107, 113-15, 136, 157-59, 167-68, 173
active learning; learning-by-doing, 77-79, 96
critical thinking; problem solving, 14, 15, 38, 55, 56, 74, 77, 94, 95, 99, 112, 145
games and simulations, 130, 131, 157
independent study, 134
individualized instruction, 10, 130-31
inquiry; discovery, 10, 15, 45, 51, 86, 97, 99, 104, 105, 107, 108, 110, 112, 115, 121, 123, 124, 129, 130-31, 137, 145, 157-59, 162, 167-68
lecture, 10
recitation, 10, 15, 167-68
source study; primary sources, 3, 6, 15, 95, 101, 175
Television (influence of): see Electronics
Testing; tests; evaluation, 43, 48, 51, 69-70, 79, 136

Textbooks: see Curriculum, materials
Tufts University, 108

Unitary field, social studies as: see Social studies
United Nations, 74, 79
"Universal History" (course): see History
Universities: see Higher education
Urban studies, 130
U.S. government (as school subject): see Government, U.S.
U.S. history (as school subject): see History, American
USSR, 85, 87, 89
Utah State University, 138

Values education; valuing, 74, 105, 115, 130, 131, 135, 137, 140, 141, 145
Vietnam War, 122, 128, 146
Volker Foundation, 77

WASPs (white Anglo-Saxon Protestants); Anglo Americans, 146, 148, 149, 150
Wayne State University, 77
"Western Civilization" (course), 32, 76, 80
Who's Who, 69
Wisconsin, University of, 9, 20
Women's studies, 130, 145, 147, 153
Woods Hole (Massachusetts) Conference (1959), 97
World history: see History
World War I, 26, 28-30, 32, 66, 67, 74, 76, 183
World War II, 16, 55, 65-67, 72-78, 81, 89, 178, 183

Yale University, 5, 8